

**THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESURRECTION FOR THE APOSTOLIC MESSAGE
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE APOSTLE PAUL**

A Thesis

**Submitted to the
Faculty of Divinity, New College
The University of Edinburgh**

**In Partial Fulfilment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy**

By

Francis Small Chesson

September, 1958



PREFACE

A firm belief in the reality of the resurrection of Jesus Christ lies at the basis of all apostolic thought and life, and apart from this belief the very existence of apostolic Christianity is unintelligible and inexplicable. This assurance of the Risen Christ was not a development spread over a long time which gradually received strength; rather it sprang suddenly into existence and swept irresistibly over the whole body of disciples. From the very beginning the resurrection has been a principal article of the Christian belief, and it finds expression throughout the New Testament, being mentioned directly at least forty-six times outside the accounts of the Gospels. These references to the Risen Christ reveal to us the moral and spiritual meaning of the resurrection which the writer or speaker has experienced in his own being, either as the result of an appearance of our Lord or as having experienced that blessedness which is promised to those "who have not seen and yet believed." Indeed, the Christian Church came into being with the preaching of the good news of the resurrection of Jesus from the dead, and it was before all else the Church of the Resurrection. And because this is so historically, the very existence of the Church will always be the foremost "proof" of the fact of the resurrection.

There have been many works on the resurrection since the beginning of the century. The various studies dealing with the historical validity of the resurrection have hitherto given disproportionate consideration to

the examination of the Gospel accounts of the resurrection appearances and the accompanying phenomena. Far too often these historical and literary problems have been discussed in isolation from the resurrection gospel with which the history is bound-up, and from the theology which made the Easter story worth the telling. There has long been a need for a comprehensive work dealing with the theological significance of the resurrection for the primitive church--this thesis attempts the task. Our aim is not primarily that of trying to influence the judgment of the historical critic; nor is it to deal with critical questions, such as the process by which the resurrection story finally developed into the Gospel accounts. Rather, we seek to interpret the fact of the resurrection--assuming it as fact and reality. We endeavour to present the resurrection as the "starting-point" and "interpretative principle" of New Testament theology, following the present-day emphasis by Professor Floyd V. Filson of the McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago. While our General Introduction (Part I) on "The Relationship of the Pauline Account of the Resurrection Appearances with the Gospel Accounts" does border on the nature of an historical study, we include it because, as stated above, the historical is not to be excluded from the theological significance. But mainly, we consider it necessary to prepare the way for the body of the thesis.

The thesis is divided into five Parts. After Part I, serving as a General Introduction on the relationship of the resurrection appearances, Parts II, III, and IV deal respectively with the Christological, Soteriological, and Eschatological significance of the resurrection. While we

have endeavoured to use these divisions (Parts II, III, and IV) in presenting the interpretative rôle of the resurrection, we realize that it is impossible to separate neatly the Christological significance from the Soteriological, or the Soteriological from the Eschatological, as the three are closely inter-related. Part V presents the General Summary and Conclusions of our study. All the direct biblical quotations that appear are from the Revised Standard Version, unless otherwise specified. The Greek references are from Nestle's Novum Testamentum Graece (22 Auflage, 1956).

As we consider the resurrection we remember that as a doctrine the resurrection cannot rightly be isolated from the corpus of Christian truth. Such a study would be artificial and unsatisfying. Thus the author will attempt to look at the resurrection remembering that it is an integral part of the whole and not the whole itself. From the time we began this study the words of B. F. Westcott have been ever before us: "To preach the fact of the Resurrection was the first function of the Evangelists; to embody the doctrine of the Resurrection is the great office of the Church; to learn the meaning of the Resurrection is the task not of one age only, but of all."¹

I would like to acknowledge indebtedness to my advisers, Professor J. S. Stewart and the late Professor William Manson, for their helpful

¹The Gospel of the Resurrection, 9th Ed. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1913), pp. 6 f.

guidance and encouragement throughout this study. Also I wish to thank the Rev. R. A. S. Barbour who from the beginning offered suggestions, and, after the death of Professor Manson, served as an official adviser. Of the various libraries consulted, I would like to mention in particular that of New College and the University of Edinburgh, and express my appreciation to the librarians and staffs for their kind assistance in obtaining works not immediately available.

September, 1958

F. S. C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

GENERAL INTRODUCTION: THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE PAULINE ACCOUNT OF THE RESURRECTION APPEARANCES WITH THE GOSPEL ACCOUNTS

(Sections)	(Pages)
I: INTRODUCTION: THE IMPORTANCE OF PAUL'S LIST OF RESURRECTION APPEARANCES IN I CORINTHIANS 15:5-8	2
II: HE APPEARED TO CEPHAS (VERSE 5A)	10
A. General Observations	10
B. Significance of <i>ᾠφθn</i>	14
C. Gospel Parallels	16
D. Locality of the Appearance	17
III: THEN TO THE TWELVE (VERSE 5B)	21
A. Gospel Parallels and General Observations	21
B. Reason for Remaining in Jerusalem	24
IV: THEN HE APPEARED TO MORE THAN FIVE HUNDRED (VERSE 6)	26
A. Location of the Appearance	26
B. Gospel Parallels	28
C. General Observations	30
V: THEN HE APPEARED TO JAMES (VERSE 7A)	32
A. Omission of the Appearance in the Gospels	32
B. Reference in the <u>Gospel according to the Hebrews</u>	35
C. General Observations	37

VI: THEN TO ALL THE APOSTLES (VERSE 7B)	39
A. The Meaning of Ἀπὸς τοὺς	40
B. Relation of the Appearance to the Ascension	41
VII: LAST OF ALL HE APPEARED TO ME (VERSE 8)	44
A. Relation of the Appearance to Paul's Apostleship	46
B. Nature of the Appearance	47
C. Further Significance of ὡφθῆναι	49
VIII: CONCLUSION	53

PART II

THE CHRISTOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESURRECTION

Introduction	63
I: THE CHRIST	64
A. JESUS' MESSIAHSHIP AND HIS RESURRECTION	65
1. The Crucifixion a Stumbling-Block	66
2. The Interpretative Principle of the Resurrection	68
B. THE TESTIMONY OF PETER AND THE EARLY CHURCH TO JESUS' MESSIAHSHIP	70
C. THE TESTIMONY OF PAUL TO JESUS' MESSIAHSHIP: The Apostle's Development	81
D. THE MESSIANIC SECRET AND THE RESURRECTION	84
E. THE MESSIAHSHIP AND THE BELIEF IN THE RESURRECTION	90
F. CONCLUSION	93

II: LORD	95
A. THE USE OF THE TITLE "LORD": ITS PRE- AND POST- RESURRECTION SIGNIFICANCE	95
1. Testimony of Thomas and Peter	100
2. Testimony of Paul and His Development	102
B. THE USE OF THE TITLE "LORD" IN THE WORSHIP OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH	108
1. The Lord's Day	108
2. Prayer Directed to Christ as Lord	112
3. The Lord's Supper	114
a) The Lord's Supper and the Resurrection Appearances	115
b) The "Last" Supper and the Origin of the Eucharist	117
C. WORSHIP OF CHRIST AS A CULTUS	119
D. BACKGROUND OF THE USE OF KYRICS	121
E. CONCLUSION	126
III: THE SON OF GOD	128
A. BACKGROUND OF THE TERM "SON OF GOD"	130
B. THE RESURRECTION AND CHRIST'S SONSHIP	132
1. Sonship Eternal	132
2. Son in Power after the Resurrection	135
3. According to the Spirit of Holiness	137
4. By the Resurrection of the Dead	138
C. CONCLUSION	139

IV: THE LAST ADAM	140
A. CHRIST/ADAM PARALLEL IN I CORINTHIANS 15:45-49	140
1. Contrast between Christ and Adam	141
2. The New Age	144
3. The New Humanity	146
4. Relation of the Expressions "Last Adam" and "Second Adam"	149
B. CHRIST/ADAM PARALLEL IN ROMANS 5:12-21 AND ELSEWHERE	152
C. THE POST-RESURRECTION SIGNIFICANCE OF THE "LAST ADAM" CONCEPT	155
D. THE ORIGINALITY OF THE "LAST ADAM" CONCEPT	159
E. CONCLUSION	162
V: GENERAL CONCLUSION	164

PART III

THE SOTERIOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESURRECTION

I: INTRODUCTION: THE RELATION OF THE CROSS AND THE RESURRECTION	167
A. The Cross and Resurrection Inseparable	169
B. The Resurrection the Starting-Point in Understanding the Work of Christ	176
II: THE HOLY SPIRIT	180
A. THE RISEN CHRIST AND THE HOLY SPIRIT	180
1. Peter's Sermon and the Testimony of the Gospels	181

2. Paul's Testimony and Development	184
B. THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT	187
III: JUSTIFICATION; THE RELATION OF THE RESURRECTION TO JUSTIFICATION	191
A. Justification an Accomplished Fact through the Resurrection	193
B. Justification Inseparably Linked with Both the Death and Resurrection	194
IV: RISING WITH CHRIST OR PAUL'S MYSTICISM	197
A. THE POWER OF THE RESURRECTION A PRESENT REALITY . . .	198
1. A Mystical Union	200
2. Significance of the Phrase "In Christ"	204
B. THE RELATION OF BAPTISM TO RISING WITH CHRIST	206
C. THE RELATION OF THE PRESENT RESURRECTION OF BELIEVERS WITH CHRIST'S RESURRECTION	209
D. THE ORIGIN OF PAUL'S MYSTICISM	212
1. The Influence of the Early Church	214
2. Paul's Personal Experience	215
V: CONCLUSION	217

PART IV

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESURRECTION

I: INTRODUCTION; THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESURRECTION FOR ESCHATOLOGY	220
--	-----

II: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST	
AND THAT OF BELIEVERS	223
A. CHRIST THE FIRST-FRUIT OF THE RESURRECTION	223
B. ACTIVITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT	226
III: THE NATURE OF THE RESURRECTION BODY	229
A. THE RESURRECTION BODY OF BELIEVERS PATTERNED AFTER	
THAT OF CHRIST	229
1. The Resurrection Body as a Spiritual Body	230
2. The Resurrection Body Not Mere Spirit	233
3. The Natural Body Transformed into the Spiritual	237
4. Purpose of I Corinthians 15	239
B. ORIGIN OF THE CONCEPT OF THE SPIRITUAL BODY	244
C. DEVELOPMENT OF PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF THE RESURRECTION	
BODY	246
1. The Hellenization of the Apostle's Thinking?	248
2. Parallel and New Ideas in the Comparison of	
I Corinthians 15 and II Corinthians 5	249
IV: THE INTERMEDIATE STATE	253
A. Various Interpretations of II Corinthians 5:1 ff.	253
B. The Resurrection Body Acquired at the Parousia	256
C. The Believer with Christ	259
D. Activity of the Holy Spirit	261
V: TWO RESURRECTIONS	266
A. Basis of the View of Two Separate Resurrections	266

B. Objections to the Two-resurrection Hypothesis . . .	268
VI: THE GENERAL RESURRECTION: The Resurrection To Include	
All	275
VII: CONCLUSION	279

PART V

GENERAL SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I: The Christological Significance of the Resurrection . .	283
II: The Soteriological Significance of the Resurrection . .	286
III: The Eschatological Significance of the Resurrection . .	287
BIBLIOGRAPHY	290

LIST OF PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS

B.N.T.I.E.---The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology,
ed. by W. D. Davies and D. Daube.

E.T.---The Expository Times.

H.B.N.T.---Handbuch zum Neuen Testament.

H.T.R.---The Harvard Theological Review.

I.B.---The Interpreter's Bible, ed. by George A. Buttrick.

J.B.L.---Journal of Biblical Literature.

M.N.T.C.---The Moffatt New Testament Commentary.

N.T.S.---New Testament Studies.

R.H.P.R.---Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses.

S.J.T.---Scottish Journal of Theology.

T.W.N.T.---Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. by Gerhard
Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich.

Z.N.T.W.---Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die
Kunde der älteren Kirche.

PART I

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE PAULINE ACCOUNT OF THE RESURRECTION
APPEARANCES WITH THE GOSPEL ACCOUNTS

BULSTON

Extra Strong

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE PAULINE ACCOUNT OF THE RESURRECTION
APPEARANCES WITH THE GOSPEL ACCOUNTS

I: INTRODUCTION

The faith in the resurrection is largely dependent upon the appearances of the Risen Lord, and in the whole of the New Testament we have records of ten such manifestations,¹ but not all of them are contained in any single authority. It is conceivable that different accounts of the resurrection were circulated among the disciples, and examples of these traditions have been transmitted to us with little attempt at harmonization. The evidence for this supreme act of God consists mainly in the testimony of the Gospels, Acts, and Paul's epistles. Though Paul's testimony is the briefest, it is at the same time the earliest, and he has mentioned more of the Risen Christ's appearances than any single evangelist. Hence it seems appropriate that our study of the significance of the resurrection for the apostolic message should begin with the Apostle Paul's account.

THE IMPORTANCE OF PAUL'S LIST OF RESURRECTION APPEARANCES

IN I CORINTHIANS 15:5-8

The earliest reference which comes nearest to resembling any kind

¹Throughout PART I the three words "appearance," "appearing," and "manifestation" are used interchangeably. The author avoids the term

of formulated plan in giving the resurrection appearances is that found in the fifteenth chapter of I Corinthians, verses 5-8, and its authenticity is practically undisputed.² I Corinthians was written from Ephesus probably in the spring of A. D. 55³ and therefore this passage, being written some twenty years after the event, is the earliest list of resurrection witnesses to be found in the New Testament.⁴

"vision" because it seems clear that what the disciples saw was no mere projection of their imagination or product of their mental condition. Vide infra.

²One of the ablest of those who deny its genuineness is W. C. Van Manen in his work Paulus. Van Manen's successor at Leyden, Kirsopp Lake, says: "I am however, quite unable to share my predecessor's view on this point." See Lake, The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ (London: Williams & Norgate, 1907), p. 37, footnote. A full treatment of Van Manen's views is given in C. Clemen's Paulus: sein Leben und Wirken, Vol. I (Giessen: J. Ricker'sche, 1904). See author index for references. P. W. Schmiedel, "Resurrection and Ascension Narratives," Encyclopaedia Biblica (1914), col. 4055, accepts I Cor. 15 as a genuine work by Paul. E. W. Barnes, who thinks of I Cor. 15:3-8 as "originally a separate tract of the resurrection," reaches this conclusion: "We are forced to the conclusion that it cannot be historical and that, as a story, it is much later than the time of Paul." See The Rise of Christianity (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1947), p. 172; cf. pp. 228, 239.

³The most extreme opinions fix the date between 52-59 A. D. Cf. B. F. Westcott, The Gospel of the Resurrection, p. 108.

⁴The term "resurrection witnesses" is used in its general meaning of those who experienced an appearance after the resurrection. Of course, there are no canonical accounts of anyone present at the actual moment of the resurrection. However, in the apocryphal Gospel of St. Peter the actual moment is described: "The soldiers, therefore, when they saw it [the rolling away of the stone and the entrance of two men of heaven into the tomb], awakened the centurion and the elders (for they were also there keeping watch); and as they told the things that they had seen, again they see three men coming forth from the tomb, two of them supporting the other, and a cross following them; and the head of the two reached to heaven, but that of Him who was led by them overpassed the heavens. And they heard a voice from the heavens, saying, Thou didst

It is probable that Paul intended the list to be chronological because of his careful use of "then [$\epsilon\hat{\iota}\tau\alpha$] . . . thereafter [$\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha$] . . . thereafter [$\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha$] . . . then [$\epsilon\hat{\iota}\tau\alpha$] . . . last [$\epsilon\tau\chi\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$]." Schmiedel agrees that Paul gives these appearances in the order of their occurrence, but he would insist that the careful enumeration also guarantees completeness.⁵ However, there is no real evidence that Paul intends this passage to be an exhaustive evidential account of the resurrection, and the bare list is totally insufficient for such a purpose. Paul gives this account, not as a narrative, but rather as a summary of the principal witnesses, mentioning only their names or number, and saying nothing of the attending circumstances.

Of the ten appearances, Paul mentions six, making no mention of the appearances to the women at the grave (Matt. 28:1-8; Mark 16:9-11; and John 20:11-18), to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus (Luke 24:13-35), or to the seven disciples at the Sea of Galilee (John 21:1-14). C. V. Weizsäcker says that because of Paul's silence concerning the

preach to them that sleep; and a response was heard from the cross, Yea." (From H. B. Swete, The Akhmim Fragment of the Apocryphal Gospel of St Peter, London: Macmillan and Co., 1893, p. 27). Swete, p. xlv, assigns the date ca. A. D. 165-170 as the probable date of the writing of the Gospel. See Robert M. Grant, "The Resurrection of the Body," Part I, The Journal of Religion, XXVII, No. 2 (April, 1948), p. 128, who says: "This may merely reflect popular imagination; but it is difficult to avoid supposing that it intended to exclude a resurrection of the flesh." Cf. Otto Pfleiderer, Primitive Christianity, trans. by J. F. Smith (London: Williams and Norgate, 1906), III, pp. 214-224.

⁵Op. cit., cols. 4057 f.

appearance to the women, and because he places the appearance to Peter first on his list, "The only possible explanation is that the Apostle was ignorant of its [the appearance to the women] existence."⁶ However, as we think of Paul's omission of resurrection appearances, we must bear in mind the purpose of the Apostle's giving these witnesses. Evidently he had learned that some of the Corinthians had committed themselves to the illogical position of believing in the resurrection of Christ and yet rejecting the general resurrection of the dead. Thus the Apostle's ultimate purpose is not to prove the resurrection of Christ because this was not in doubt, but rather to demonstrate the fallacy of their attitude of disbelief in the glorified life after death, which he does on the basis of their belief in the Lord's resurrection. He states that to deny the resurrection of the dead is by implication to deny Christ's resurrection, and in his reductio ad absurdum argument Paul goes on to show (vss. 14-18) that to deny the resurrection renders the whole saving worth of the Gospel witness ineffective. Since it was not

⁶ The Apostolic Age, trans. from the 2nd Rev. Ed. by James Millar (London: Williams and Norgate, 1894), Vol. I, p. 5. In addition, some have maintained that Paul knew nothing of the empty tomb. Faith in the resurrection originated from the fact of the empty grave (as emphasized by the Gospels) but it was not until the appearances that the resurrection became a reality with the disciples. Paul evidently had a knowledge of the empty grave since he states that Jesus was buried and raised of the third day (I Cor. 15:4). In addition, his teaching about the resurrection body (vide infra) implies an empty tomb. As both Maurice Goguel (Jesus the Nazarene--Myth or History?, trans. by Frederick Stephens, London: T. Fisher Unwin Ltd., 1926, p. 220; La Foi a la Résurrection de Jésus dans le Christianisme Primitif, Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux, 1933, pp. 441-445) and Selby Vernon McCasland (The

necessary for Paul to give exhaustive evidence for Christ's resurrection, he recalls briefly the main facts which he had already "delivered" (vs. 3) to them. The Corinthians would be able to fill in the details of the outline from the memory of what Paul had previously taught them.⁷ As the Apostle develops his argument it is natural that he should present a summary of the principal witnesses to the first resurrection before advancing to his doctrinal discourse on the hope of the future life for disciples which was in reality the primary purpose of this outstanding chapter.⁸

This summary of witnesses is not original with the Apostle since he states that he had received (ΠΔΡΕΛΔΒΟΝ) it. Evidently it was a formulated apostolic tradition dealing with the proclamation of the Gospel--the Kerygma--which was handed down to Paul by eye-witnesses.⁹

resurrection of Jesus, New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1932, pp. 44 f.) have shown, Paul's faith in the resurrection is linked with the appearances rather than the empty tomb.

⁷Cf. C. Clemen, op. cit., p. 64.

⁸W. J. S. Simpson, The Resurrection and Modern Thought (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1911), p. 126.

⁹Cf. J. A. Robinson, "Paul's Knowledge of Jesus," The Congregational Quarterly, XIII, No. 3 (1935), p. 302; C. H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures (London: Nisbet & Co., Ltd., 1952), pp. 11 f.; A. M. Hunter, The Unity of the New Testament (London: S.C.M. Press, 1943), pp. 20 ff. Cf. also Kerygma and Myth, ed. by Hans Werner Bartsch, trans. by Reginald H. Fuller (London: S.P.C.K., 1953), p. 112, where Bultmann states that he does not accept I Cor. 15:3-8 as kerygma. J. Jeremias, "ΠΔΙΣ ΘΕΟΪ," T.W.N.T., V (1954), pp. 703 f., thinks this primitive kerygma goes back to Isaiah 53. He states: "Hier ist an erster St das alte Kerygma I K 15, 3-5 zu nennen, das auf semitischen Urtext zurückgeht u[und] dessen ΚΑΤΑ ΤΙΣ ΥΡΑΦΙΣ in v 3 wegen des ὙΠΕΡ ΤΩΝ

The passage no doubt represents the tradition that Paul had found in the church at his conversion, or at the time of his first visit to Jerusalem, and represents likewise the Apostle's preaching to the Corinthians.¹⁰

The Apostle tells us that he went to Jerusalem three years after his conversion with the express purpose of visiting ($\dot{\iota}\tau\tau\omicron\rho\epsilon\dot{\iota}\nu$) Peter, and while there he saw James (Gal. 1:18, 19). Paul's purpose in visiting Peter probably was to make his acquaintance rather than to receive any instructions from him,¹¹ but it is reasonable to believe that while the Apostle was in Jerusalem he learned the details of the resurrection story from Peter and James.¹²

$\dot{\iota}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\dot{\iota}\omega\nu$ $\dot{\eta}\mu\omega\nu$ auf Js 53 bezogen werden muss. Zu dem vorpaulinischen Traditionsgut, das auf Js 53 Bezug nimmt, gehören ferner die liturgisch formulierten Abendmahls Worte I K 11, 23-25 . . ." So also L. S. Thornton, The Common Life in the Body of Christ, 3rd Ed. (Westminster [London]: Dacre Press, 1950), p. 257.

¹⁰K. Lake, op. cit., p. 41.

¹¹George S. Duncan, The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians (M.N.T.C.), (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1934), p. 31. However, Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, II, Rev. Ed. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1900), p. 265, says that $\dot{\iota}\tau\tau\omicron\rho\epsilon\dot{\iota}\nu$ "implies a careful and searching inquiry on his [Paul's] part."

¹²To account for Paul's statement in Gal. 1:11, 12 that he did not get his gospel from man with the fact that he "received" this tradition, see C. H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments, New Ed. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1944), pp. 19 f.; George Matheson, Spiritual Development of St. Paul (Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1890), pp. 114 ff.; and especially William Baird's excellent article, "What Is the Kerygma? A Study of I Cor 15: 3-8 and Gal 1:11-17," J.B.L., LXXVI, Part III (Sept., 1957), pp. 181-191. Professor Hunter, op. cit., p. 16, thinks that the form of the passage does not suggest something learned in conversation. He suggests that it is a baptismal creed of the Damascus Church given to Paul by Ananias. G. R. Beasley Murray, Christ Is Alive! (London: Lutterworth Press, 1947), p. 49, agrees with Hunter that Paul probably received this tradition from

It is hardly possible to separate the original tradition which the Apostle received from the additions which he must have made. Obviously, his own experience is added, and perhaps he also attached the apologetic commentary accompanying the appearance to the five hundred. The construction of the passage does not actually assert that the entire list was given to Paul, but it is probable that the first five appearances belonged to the original tradition.¹³ Maurice Goguel states that this text was "the earliest expression of faith" and that "Its rhythmic form makes it easily recognizable."¹⁴ Thus if there were a kerygmatic formula, as many scholars believe, the substance of it would be:

Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures,
 And He was buried,
 He was raised on the third day, according to the Scriptures,
 And He appeared to Cephas, then to the Twelve.
 Then He appeared to more than five hundred brethren at one time,¹⁵
 He appeared to James, then to all the Apostles.¹⁶

Ananias and the other disciples at Damascus immediately after his conversion.

¹³Cf. A. M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors (London: Nicholson and Watson, 1940), pp. 15 f.

¹⁴The Birth of Christianity, trans. by H. C. Snape (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1953), p. 42.

¹⁵Because of the commentary accompanying the appearance to the five hundred, Goguel (Ibid.) thinks that this manifestation could not have belonged to the original formula. Cf. W. J. S. Simpson, op. cit., pp. 127 f.

¹⁶Note the similarity in tone and confidence between this tradition of the resurrection and that of the Eucharistic observance in I Cor. 11:23. W. Sanday, Outlines of the Life of Christ, 2nd Ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906), pp. 173 f., says: "In the same precise and

According to the tradition, both the death and the resurrection are connected with the Scriptures. Thus Paul means that the religious value which he attributes to the death of the Lord had been foretold by the prophets. In going on to say that "He was raised on the third day according to the Scriptures" he means not merely that the resurrection's value was confirmed by the Scriptures, but that, as the resurrection had taken place and had been witnessed, he is justified in ascertaining the third day as the date of the Messiah's resurrection, because of scriptural inferences.¹⁷ A detailed examination of Paul's summary list will show how it is related to the Gospel accounts.

deliberate manner in which he had rehearsed the particulars of the Last Supper, St. Paul enumerates one by one the leading appearances of the Lord after the resurrection . . ."

¹⁷K. Lake, op. cit., p. 29. For a discussion of the possible scriptural passages (Jonah 1:17; Hosea 6:2; and II Kings 20:8) that the Apostle could have had in mind, see Lake, pp. 30 ff.; Benjamin Wisner Bacon, Jesus the Son of God or Primitive Christology (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1911), pp. 65 ff.

II: HE APPEARED TO CEPHAS (VERSE 5A)

Cephas, almost certainly the Apostle Peter, seems to have been a favourite designation of Paul as he always uses it in reference to Peter in this letter (cf. I Cor. 1:12; 3:22; 9:5; 15:5).¹ Peter was well known, especially in Corinth where there was a "Cephas" party (I Cor. 1:12). In Galatians 1:18 Paul gives us the occasion during which he probably learned of this appearance to Peter. During the fifteen days that Paul was visiting (*ἰστορεῖν*) Peter it is to be expected that an important theme of their conversation was an exchange of their experiences in encountering the Risen Lord. This was Paul's first meeting with any of the Twelve and the visit must have had an important bearing on his information as to the facts of the life of Jesus.²

General Observations

The grammatical construction of Paul's statement of Jesus' resurrection and of the appearance to Peter ("that he was raised on the third day . . . and that he appeared to Cephas; then to the Twelve") continues to the end of verse 5 and then changes ("then he appeared . . ."). F. H. Chase thinks this construction indicates that the Apostle is seeking

¹On the identity of the Apostle Peter as Cephas see Donald W. Riddle, "The Cephas-Peter Problem, and a Possible Solution," J.B.L., LIX, Part II (June, 1940), pp. 169-180; Norman Huffman, "Emmaus Among the Resurrection Narratives," J.B.L., LXIV, Part II (June, 1945), pp. 205-226.

²George Matheson, Spiritual Development of St. Paul, pp. 114-117.

to confirm the fact that the Risen Lord appeared to Peter on the same day as the Lord's resurrection.³ While it is probable that Peter did witness this manifestation on the resurrection day, it does not seem justifiable to make this mere grammatical structure the basis of such reasoning since such a break is not unusual with Paul.⁴ The passage asserts that it was the act of God (not necessarily including the experience of Peter) which took place on the third day.

Lyder Brun⁵ and Adolf Harnack⁶ have expressed the view that here in I Corinthians 15 Paul is joining together two conflicting views of the early Christian preaching. They believe that the original message as it was preached embodied an appearance to an individual and then to a group.⁷ There was competition as to which individual should have the

³The Gospels in the Light of Historical Criticism (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1914), pp. 40 f. While Lake (op. cit., pp. 28, 37) admits that this interpretation is tenable, he points out that "if we interpret the passage strictly, a distinction is made between the resurrection on the third day and the appearances of the Risen Lord." The Galilean tradition (vide infra) of this appearance to Peter would naturally exclude the possibility of the appearance on the third day because Peter would not have had time to return home. See McCasland, op. cit., p. 51. He maintains: "The only account which places it on the third day is Luke 24:34, but it is plain that this fragmentary record does not stand in its original setting, for the entire narrative of the appearance has fallen away . . ."

⁴J. M. Shaw, The Resurrection of Christ (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1920), p. 28.

⁵Die Auferstehung Christi in der urchristlichen Überlieferung (Oslo, 1925), p. 33. (As cited by McCasland, op. cit., pp. 45 f.)

⁶Sitzungsbericht der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, VII, (1922), pp. 62 f. (As cited by McCasland, op. cit., pp. 45 f.)

⁷Cf. F. W. Grosheide, Commentary on the First Epistle to the

honour of the first appearance. One tradition would thus be sponsored by Peter; the other sponsored by James and the 'brothers' of James (vide infra). That there existed two distinct traditions is certainly within reason, and the balanced statements (He appeared to Peter, then to the twelve; He appeared to James, then to all the apostles) are not contrary to such a view. In agreeing that there is some plausibility in the idea of two separate lists, C. H. Dodd cautions:

This is possible, but in that case we must certainly take it that the two lists had been combined before the formula was transmitted to Paul, since he expressly says that the list, as he gives it, was common to all Christian missionaries; and this was of controversial value to him, because it was representative of the party of James who were his principal opponents within the Church.⁸

Dodd's view on this question seems most valid.

It is reasonable to suppose that Peter was still brooding over his denial of the Lord. Though the Apostle had denied his Lord, he still devotedly loved Him. In commenting on this appearance to Peter, Maurice Goguel states that Peter still had great devotion and love for Jesus after His death, and that Peter thought and hoped that Jesus had triumphed over death and was alive in heaven. Goguel goes on to say,

Corinthians, 2nd Ed. (Edinburgh: Marshall & Scott, Ltd., 1954), p. 352. In commenting on the appearance to James, Grosheide suggests that there is an analogy between the appearance to Peter and that to James: "there it was Peter first and then the Twelve; here James first and then a greater circle of apostles."

⁸"The Appearances of the Risen Christ," Studies in the Gospels (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), p. 28, footnote. Cf. Gustav W. Stählin, "On the Third Day," trans. by Wayne P. Todd, Interpretation, X, No. 3 (July, 1950), pp. 282-299; Paul Winter, "I Corinthians XV 3b-7," Novum Testamentum, II, Fasc. 2 (April, 1957), pp. 146 ff.

"mais qui était encore étranger à l'idée d'une manifestation de cette vie sur la terre avant le moment de la parousie."⁹

The Lord's words to the Apostle are found neither in Peter's preaching, nor in any of Paul's letters. Perhaps they were too personal and not even shared with Paul, nor with any of the disciples. Whatever the words were, they transformed Peter, restored his peace of mind, and empowered him to strengthen his brethren. The transformation which took place in the Apostle is reflected in the excitement which the report of it created among the disciples (Luke 24:34).

One could easily get the impression that Paul means this appearance to Peter to be the first manifestation of the Risen Lord. Although Paul does not mention the testimony of the women who visited the tomb, he does not say that the Lord appeared first to Peter.¹⁰ Paul is giving

⁹La Foi a la Résurrection de Jésus dans le Christianisme Primitif, p. 395. In relating the appearance to Peter with that to Paul and the other disciples, Goguel states: "La première christophanie s'est produite pour un homme qui croyait en Jésus et qui l'aimait mais qui ignorait l'idée d'une manifestation de sa vie sur la terre après sa mort, tandis que la christophanie paulinienne a eu lieu pour un homme qui savait que les disciples de Jésus prétendaient l'avoir vu vivant, mais qui ne l'aimait pas et ne croyait pas en lui. La première christophanie a créé une foi nouvelle, les autres ont déterminé l'adhésion à une foi déjà constituée." (p. 395) For a general analysis of the meaning of the appearance to Peter, see S. V. McCasland, "Peter's Vision of the Risen Christ," J.B.L., XLVII (1928), pp. 41-59.

¹⁰Chrysostom says that "among men [that is, males] He [Christ] was seen of him first. . . For he that first confessed Him to be Christ, was justly also counted worthy first to behold His resurrection" and also because he desired so much to see Him again. See The Homilies of S. John Chrysostom on the First Epistle of St. Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians, [no translator], (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1839), Part II, Hom. XXV-XLIV. Homily XXXVIII. A. Harnack, "Primitive Legends of Christendom," The Date of the Acts and of The Synoptic Gospels, trans. by J. R.

only a selection of the appearances known to him and he is not attempting to give an exhaustive list, as we have already stated.¹¹

Significance of ὡφθον

The verb ὡφθον is regularly used, not as a passive "was seen" (AV), but as a deponent verb, "appeared" (RSV).¹² The ordinary use of ὡφθον in the New Testament is of some unusual phenomenon of spiritual manifestation or visual experience. The term is sometimes used in connection with visions (Acts 16:9),¹³ but it is used equally of seeing which is not visionary (John 20:18, 25; Acts 7:26). Here the context must decide in favour of the latter because of the use of εἰπεῖν.¹⁴ Thus Professor Karl H. Rengstorff insists that in

Wilkinson (London: Williams & Norgate, 1911), pp. 157 ff., states that the Primitive Church of Jerusalem very soon lost a certain and uncontroverted tradition both in regard to the person who was the first to see the Lord as well as in regard to the locality of the first appearance. Cf. also McCasland, *op. cit.*, p. 200, note 22. In this connection B. W. Bacon, The Founding of the Church (London: Constable & Co. Ltd., 1919), pp. 42 f., maintains that the story of the appearance to Peter was intentionally lost because the primitive church preferred the Jerusalemic story of the empty tomb and of the women's vision of angels.

¹¹For a study of the history of the struggle over who experienced the first appearance in the early church see Martin Albertz, "Zur Formgeschichte der Auferstehungsberichte," Z.N.T.W., 1922, Heft 4, pp. 263-269.

¹²C. T. Craig, "The First Epistle to the Corinthians," I.B., X (1954), p. 218. Professor J. S. Stewart (A Man In Christ, p. 125) points out that this verb is the regular Septuagint expression for the revelation of the Deity to man.

¹³Schmiedel, *op. cit.*, col. 4079, insists that ὡφθον always stands for another kind of seeing than that of the ordinary sense perception.

¹⁴Cf. A. Robertson and A. Plummer, First Epistle of St. Paul to

I Corinthians 15:3 ff. "he appeared" is not sufficient to express what *ὤφθον* means.¹⁵ He asserts that the becoming visible is not dependent on the observer but on the Person that appears, God making it perceptible to the eyes of the disciples.¹⁶ Paul's purpose is to prove the bodily resurrection, and it is impossible to see how a mere vision, a purely spiritual appearance of the Lord, could demonstrate his objective. *Ἐγλήβετο* (literally, "has been raised") is a change from the aorist (used of what took place once for all) to the perfect denoting a result which abides. The sense is that He remains alive as the Risen One. Several scriptural references show that this "raising" is assigned to the Father on other occasions as well, and the passive form points to the fact that by raising up Jesus the Father set His seal on the work that Jesus had accomplished in atoning for man's sin.¹⁷ *Ἐγλήβετο*

the Corinthians (The International Critical Commentary), Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911, p. 336; Karl H. Rengstorff, Die Auferstehung Jesu, 2nd Ed. (Witten, Ruhr: Luther Verlag, 1954), pp. 37 f., 44, 83 f., 93 ff.; McCasland, op. cit., p. 43.

¹⁵Die Auferstehung Jesu, p. 44.

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷In this connection A. W. Argyle has shown that "In the vast majority of instances the New Testament says, not that Jesus 'rose' from the dead, but that God (the Father) 'raised Him' from the dead or that Jesus 'was raised' or 'hath been raised.' Out of the sixty-four references to our Lord's Resurrection in the New Testament, there are only eight passages which afford an exception to the rule. They are I Thess. 4:14 (ἀνέστη), Ro. 14:9 (ἐζησεν), Mk. 9:31 (ἀναστήσεται), 8:31, 9:10, Luke 24:46, John 20:9, Acts 17:3 (ἀναστήσεται)." See Argyle's article "The New Testament Doctrine of the Resurrection of Our Lord Jesus Christ," E.T., LXI, No. 6 (March, 1950).

can be translated "has risen" because in later Greek ἐγείρω was used in the passive and middle in the sense of "to rise."¹⁸

Gospel Parallels

A Gospel parallel to this appearance is not precise.¹⁹ Luke (24:34) makes mention of an appearance to Peter, but does not recount it.²⁰ The preferred text makes mention of a manifestation to Cleopas

pp. 187-188. Cf. M. Goguel, The Birth of Christianity, p. 72, who thinks of Paul's conception of the resurrection as "passive" and John's as "active" in that the latter thinks of Christ as raising Himself, because he has the power to lay down His life and take it up again (10:17-18). Aquinas (Summa Theologica, III, Ques. 53, Art. 4) maintains that Christ "rose again of His own power" (cf. John 10:18), but he goes on to say that the divine power of the Father and of the Son is the same. He concludes: "... accordingly these two things are mutually consequent, that Christ was raised up by the Divine power of the Father, and by His own power. (As cited by The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas, trans. by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. Part III, Second Number. QQ. XXVII-LIX. London: R. & T. Washbourne, Ltd., 1914, pp. 386 f.).

¹⁸Cf. H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, New Ed., Vol. I (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940), p. 469.

¹⁹C. A. Briggs, New Light on the Life of Jesus (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1904), p. 115, and T. S. Rordam, "What Was the Lost End of St. Mark's Gospel?", Hibbert Journal, III (July, 1905), p. 787, both argue that the original Mark contained an account of an appearance to Peter (as well as a manifestation to the women, to the Eleven at Jerusalem, to the disciples in Galilee, and at the Ascension).

²⁰Cf. C. H. Dodd, "The Appearances of the Risen Christ," op. cit., p. 28, who points out the close parallel between Luke 24:34 and I Cor. 15:4-5. Professor Lake (op. cit., pp. 101-103) finds it hard to believe that Luke himself wrote this verse because he feels that Luke, "probably the most literary of the evangelists," would hardly have left this disconnected reference to an event which he does not describe anywhere in his gospel. He suggests that it is an addition to the original text due to the influence of I Cor. 15:5, and that it was added by "someone who knew that some such phrase had been the greeting which the returning Galileans gave to their friends at Jerusalem, but did not perceive that it was inconsistent with the rest of the narrative in Luke." See also

and his companion, and the reading of the accusative participle (ΛΕΥΟΥΤΑΣ) in verse 34 indicates that when the two returned from Emmaus the Eleven told them that Jesus had appeared to Peter. The variant reading has the nominative participle ΛΕΥΟΥΤΕΣ (Codex Bezae). If the accusative is correct, it refers to the Eleven; if the nominative, to Cleopas and his companion.²¹ There is nothing in the accepted text of the narrative to show whether the appearance to Peter preceded or followed that at Emmaus.

Locality of the Appearance

As to the locality of this appearance there is nothing in I Corinthians 15 to help us, but if Nestle's text is trustworthy, and the meaning of Luke 24:34 certain, then Jerusalem was the scene. However, the author is well aware of the fact that this problem has been a battleground for many scholars.²² Some who hold the view that all the appearances occurred in Galilee (the Galilean Tradition) have interpreted Mark

Robert Leaney, "The Resurrection Narratives in Luke (xxiv. 12-53)," N.T.S., II (1955-1956), p. 111, who holds a similar view.

²¹Lake, op. cit., p. 98. Origen, who frequently identifies Cleopas' companion as Peter, probably followed the Codex Bezae (cf. Origen Against Celsus, Book II, Chapters LXII and LXVIII).

²²Cf. F. C. Grant, The Earliest Gospel (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1943), pp. 125-147; R. H. Lightfoot, Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels (London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1938), pp. 49 ff.; E. Lohmeyer, Galiäa und Jerusalem (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936). Apart from Lohmeyer's discussion of the resurrection appearances, his main thesis is that there were two outstanding centres of Christianity in Palestine, one in Jerusalem, the other in Galilee.

16:7 ("... go, tell his disciples and Peter that he is going before you to Galilee; there you will see him. . .") to imply that this appearance did not take place in the environs of Jerusalem.²³ The author feels that while the Gospels preserve two traditions as to the appearances of the Risen Lord, these are not necessarily inconsistent with each other. The Jerusalem tradition, as adopted by Luke, does not exclude the occurrence of appearances in Galilee, and the Galilean tradition of Mark (followed by Matthew) began with a manifestation to the women at the tomb. The author is in agreement with Harmen Holtrop when he says that the idea that the appearances were either in Galilee or Jerusalem is out

²³For a discussion of the Galilean tradition see K. Lake, op. cit., pp. 202, 101 ff.; F. Gardner-Smith, The Narratives of the Resurrection (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1926), pp. 140-167, "The Resurrection," The Modern Churchman, XXXV, Nos. 1, 2 & 3 (April-June, 1945), pp. 81 f.; McCasland, op. cit., pp. 49 ff.; Alfred Loisy, The Birth of the Christian Religion, trans. by L. P. Jacks (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1948), pp. 93 ff. Those who hold the "Jerusalem tradition" think that Luke represents the older tradition and that the transition of the appearances to Galilee is an error due to a misunderstanding of the unfilled prophecies of Jesus promising to meet the disciples in Galilee. Such is the view of Martin Albertz (op. cit., p. 269) who says: "... die Flucht der Jünger nach Galiläa ist eine Legende der Kritik. . ." Cf. also F. C. Burkitt, Christian Beginnings (London: University of London Press, Ltd., 1924), pp. 79 ff.

On this problem C. F. D. Moule, "The Post-Resurrection Appearances in the Light of Festival Pilgrimages," N.T.S., IV, No. 1 (Oct., 1957), p. 59, makes a wise suggestion: "Why not start from the assumption that journeys from Jerusalem home to Galilee and back again to Jerusalem would have been normal for these devout Galileans? If nothing extraordinary had happened, having come up to Jerusalem for the Passover, they would have left Jerusalem (or its environs) when the feast was over, and returned home (cf. Luke ii.43). And next, those at any rate whose business would allow it might have been found journeying up to Jerusalem again for the next feast--Pentecost."

of date--both localities are involved.²⁴ Hence, it seems reasonable to believe that this appearance to Peter took place somewhere in the Jerusalem area.

This meagre account of the manifestation to Peter is very curious when we consider the prominent position which he held among the Twelve,

²⁴De Verschijningen Onzes Heeren te Jeruzalem en in Galilea (Amsterdam: S. J. P. Bakker, 1947), pp. 143-160. For further discussion of the Double Tradition that the appearances were in (or near) Jerusalem and in Galilee, see William Park Armstrong, "The Place of the Resurrection Appearances of Jesus," Biblical and Theological Studies, by the members of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912), pp. 332-355. This view is held by E. Von Dobschütz, T. S. Rordam, Lyder Brun, Riegenback, Zahn, Voigt, A. M. Ramsey, F. C. Grant, Beasley Murray, et al.

It is true that Mark (by implication) and Matthew both speak of appearances in Galilee without mentioning any manifestations in Jerusalem. Largely because of Mark's acknowledged trustworthiness, some interpreters are led to believe that the earliest tradition about the resurrection appearances located them in Galilee only. On the other hand, Luke and John mention appearances in the Jerusalem area without telling of any in Galilee, except for John 21 which many scholars think is an appendix added after the completion of the Gospel. James Martin (while acknowledging some of the difficulties in relating the appearances in the Gospels) reaches a conclusion with which we, as well as the many others mentioned above, concur: "It should . . . be pointed out that the Gospel records are not quite so rigidly divided between separate 'Jerusalem' and 'Galilee' traditions as might be thought. It is true that what we possess of Mark makes it almost certain that he intended to go on and speak of an appearance or appearances in Galilee; but he may well have had in mind to speak of Jerusalem appearances as well. It is true that Matthew gives prominence in his narrative to Galilee, but he does record also an appearance to the women in Jerusalem. It is true that Luke makes no mention at all of a Galilaean appearance, but he is evidently covering the events of several days in very short compass, and his omission of any Galilaean appearance cannot be taken as certain evidence that he knew of none. It is true that the fourth Gospel mentions a Galilaean appearance only in the Appendix, but is it without significance that it is there mentioned?" From Did Jesus Rise From the Dead? (World Christian Books, No. 12), London: United Society For Christian Literature, 1956, pp. 41 f. Cf. p. 43. Cf. also Beasley Murray, Christ Is Alive!, pp. 55 ff.

both during the lifetime of Jesus and after Pentecost. However, the paucity of reference to it speaks highly for its historicity, for were the statement a mere invention designed to exalt Peter in the eyes of the later church, we should expect many sensational embellishments.²⁵ The importance attached to this appearance is evidenced by the fact that it convinced the Apostles when the report of the women had failed to do so. "The Lord has risen indeed and has appeared to Simon!"

²⁵Cf. R. J. Knowling, The Witness of the Epistles (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1892), p. 370.

III: THEN TO THE TWELVE (VERSE 5B)¹

The appearance to the Twelve occurred on the same day as the one to Peter. "Then" ($\epsilon\hat{\iota}\tau\alpha$), in contrast to "thereafter" ($\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha$) of verse 6, suggests that if there were any gap in time following the manifestation to Peter it came after and not before the appearance to the Twelve.² Some scholars think that this appearance is an anachronism, since Matthias had not yet been chosen, but $\sigma\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\delta\epsilon\kappa\lambda$ is a technical phrase which suggests the official body rather than the exact number of people. Thus when Paul uses this corporate term he was aware that Judas Iscariot was not present.

Gospel Parallels and General Observations

It is legitimate to identify this appearance with that to the

¹Some texts (D*FG, Latt., Goth.) thinking of Judas have $\epsilon\upsilon\delta\epsilon\kappa\lambda$ in place of $\sigma\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\delta\epsilon\kappa\lambda$ (XABKL P, Syr. Copt., Aeth.). Johannes Weiss, Der erste Korintherbrief (Meyer's Kommentar zum N. Testament), 10 Auflage (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1925), p. 350, thinks that neither $\epsilon\upsilon\delta\epsilon\kappa\lambda$ nor $\sigma\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\delta\epsilon\kappa\lambda$ is original. He states: "Die natürliche Annahme ist, dass jene Variante auf eine empfundene Lücke hinweist; es stand gar nichts da, und ein Schreiber ergänzte mechanisch die 12, ein anderer, überlegt und nach den Evv. die 11." Weiss thinks that originally the eleven were included within the appearance to all the apostles of vs. 7. A scribe who did not understand this (and who wanted to make clear an appearance to the "Twelve") inserted this appearance to the Twelve between that to Peter and that to the five hundred. A later scribe, intent on rectifying what he too felt was an omission, preferred to speak of the Eleven. However, as E. L. Allen, "The Lost Kerygma," N.T.S., III, No. 4 (July, 1957), p. 349, has pointed out, it seems much simpler to suppose that Paul wrote "the Twelve" and that a somewhat pedantic scribe altered it to "the Eleven."

²J. V. Bartlet, The Apostolic Age (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950), p. 6.

Eleven in Luke 24:36 ff. and with the Ten (Thomas being absent) in John 20:19 ff., and perhaps with Mark 16:14.³ Luke's narrative must be identified with the Johannine account because of its similarity with it in date (evening of the resurrection day), locality (Jerusalem), and words (ἑπτὰ ἐν μέσῳ, Luke 24:36 and ἑπτὰ εἰς τὸ μέσον, John 20:19).⁴ There are some variations in the two accounts but these are not significant enough to assume that the accounts refer to different appearances. Luke says that the Eleven (with others) were present; John says that there were Ten present, Thomas being absent. Luke's reference to the Eleven must be loosely interpreted in the sense of the "rest of the Eleven,"⁵ rather than on a strict numerical basis, since in the absence of Thomas only the Ten would have been present. In the Lucan account, those present with the Apostles (τοὺς τοὺς αὐτοῖς) when Cleopas and his companion returned from Emmaus were probably still present when the Lord appeared to the Ten.⁶ However, an

³The section "Mark" 16:9-20 is now generally recognized not to be Mark's work but an early compilation, written so as to make the story more complete. This, of course, is no reflection on the worth of the verses concerned; it simply means that they were not written by Mark.

⁴This striking similarity between Luke and John has led many interpreters to think that the Fourth Evangelist had Luke's Gospel among his sources. Cf. B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Rev. Ed. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1930), pp. 401 ff.; E. Basil Redlich, The Student's Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1936), pp. 117-119; P. Gardner-Smith, Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels (Cambridge: University Press, 1938), pp. 77 ff.

⁵See K. Lake (op. cit., p. 102) for a similar use of the phrase.

⁶William Manson, The Gospel of Luke (M.N.T.C.), London: Hodder and

interval may have elapsed between verses 35 and 36, as is possibly suggested by the break in Nestle's text, and in that case, they need not necessarily have been present.

Bernhard Weiss relates this appearance with the one to Peter by suggesting that when Jesus appeared to Peter He urged him to call together the disciples.⁷ If this did happen, we can understand the air of uncertainty and fear which must have been in their hearts. This was the first time that the disciples had come together in this capacity, and because of the fear of the hostile Jews they met behind closed doors. But Jesus calmed their troubled hearts when He appeared and gave His customary greeting of peace, and showed them His hands and side to convince them of His identity.

In Paul's account of this appearance to the Twelve it is not improbable that the Apostle could have had in mind the manifestation to the Eleven a week later when Thomas was present (John 20:26).⁸ But perhaps it would be safer and more correct to say that Paul's reference covers both these appearances, for as has been stated, the number Twelve cannot be pressed. The significant thing about this appearance, however, is the fact that the Lord appeared and was recognized by His chosen friends. This appearance took place under similar conditions to the

Stoughton, 1930, p. 269.

⁷The Life of Christ, trans. by John Walter Hope, III (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909), p. 401.

⁸W. J. S. Simpson, op. cit., p. 133.

previous one, probably in the upper room, the door being shut. Thomas, it will be recalled, had been unconvinced of the fact of the resurrection of the Lord, and nothing would persuade him except tangible proof. When the Lord appeared on this occasion He gave Thomas precisely the evidence which he had demanded: "Put your finger here, and see my hands; and put out your hand, and place it in my side; do not be faithless, but believing." Thomas' reason was convinced and his outburst of faith has no equal. James Orr says, "The sight and words of Jesus sufficed, without actual examination, to bring him to his Lord's feet in adoring acknowledgement."⁹

Reason for Remaining in Jerusalem

Since the Lord had directed the disciples to go to Galilee (Matt. 28:7, 10; Mark 16:7),¹⁰ it is interesting to speculate why they remained

⁹The Resurrection of Jesus (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908), p. 183.

¹⁰ Alfred Loisy, The Birth of the Christian Religion, trans. by L. P. Jacks (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1948), pp. 93 f., would maintain that this tradition, "in the form in which it has come down to us, has already taken up a legendary element in the texts which inform us that Jesus before his death, appointed a rendezvous with his disciples in Galilee, and that the order to repair to Galilee was repeated by the angel whom the women found in the empty tomb. All this is pure fiction, conceived for the purpose of disguising the collapse of the disciples, and their flight into Galilee in presence of the catastrophe which fell on their leader, and at the same time, of buttressing the myth of the resurrection." Cf. Johannes Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, I, trans. by four friends and ed. by Frederick C. Grant (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1937), pp. 14 ff.

As for the tradition in Acts 1:4 ("he charged them not to depart from Jerusalem"), this probably refers to a later time when the disciples had returned from Galilee. On this point see The Beginnings of Christianity, ed. by F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, Vol. V (Additional Notes), pp. 15 f.

in Jerusalem for the week following the first manifestation of the Lord. It is probable (as we shall see in the discussion of the next appearance) that no definite time or place for the Galilean meeting had been set, and thus there was no immediate reason why they should leave. They may have been hesitant to depart because of the obstinacy of Thomas, fearing that if they abandoned him in his unbelieving state of mind they might lose him, or the disciples may have felt that in view of the new circumstances that had arisen, they should remain in the city to bear witness to the resurrection.¹¹

¹¹James Orr, op. cit., pp. 183 f.

IV: THEN HE APPEARED TO MORE THAN FIVE HUNDRED (VERSE 6)

ἔπειτα separates more forcibly than εἰτα of verse 5, and makes the following appearance a new step in the series. The ὅτι of verse 5 is now dropped, probably to simplify the construction, but the change of structure does not necessarily imply that the following appearance had not been mentioned to the Corinthians.¹ Whenever the Apostle preached the resurrection to young churches it is to be expected that he gave the converts all the available evidence.

Location of the Appearance

This appearance almost certainly had its setting in Galilee since it was to such a large body of disciples.² The "more than five hundred" far exceeds the hundred and twenty mentioned as assembled in Jerusalem after the Ascension (Acts 1:15). Also, it would have been more difficult for such a large meeting to have taken place at Jerusalem because of the Roman authorities.³ Then too, before His death Jesus had told the

¹Joseph MacRory, The Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians (Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son, Ltd., 1935), p. 228.

²As against B. W. Bacon, The Founding of the Church (London: Constable & Co. Ltd., 1919), pp. 58 f., E. Von Dobschütz, A. Harnack, Lietzmann, et al., who think Jerusalem was the scene. Cf. M. Goguel, The Birth of Christianity, p. 43 (fn. 2) for references to E. Von Dobschütz, Harnack, and Lietzmann.

³Joseph Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, trans. by William F. Stinespring (London: Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1942), pp. 264 f.: "Galilee was the place of origin of the Messianic movement that grew up around Jesus; the news of what had happened in Jerusalem had not yet reached

disciples that after the resurrection He would go before them into Galilee,⁴ then on the day of His resurrection both the angel and Jesus Himself had repeated this promise to the women (Matt. 28:7, 10; Mark 16:6). But despite these two occasions when Jesus said He would go to Galilee, we have no information as to when a definite appointment for time and place was made. When the Apostles left Jerusalem⁵ it is doubtful that they had been given a fixed time and place to meet, and certainly when we next see them fishing at the Sea of Tiberias there is an unsettled air about them which is not the expected attitude of men who had been given definite directions for a meeting in Galilee. In his discussion of the Lord's appearance to the Seven, Henry Latham has

there; moreover, in these little provincial towns there were no prying official eyes, as in Jerusalem."

⁴Joseph Klausner, Jesus of Nazareth, trans. by Herbert Danby (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1925), p. 358, has an unusual interpretation of Jesus' exhortation to the disciples to go to Galilee. He states: "Jesus had, therefore, appointed a prearranged meeting-place (of course, during his lifetime), telling them that now, as distinct from the time when he had sent them forth from Capernaum as his Apostles, they would need purse and wallet and even a sword" (Luke 22:35-38). On the meaning of this statement of Jesus cf. C. F. Evans, "'I will go before you into Galilee,'" J.T.S., V, Part I (April, 1954), pp. 3-18. Evans discusses in detail two possible interpretations of the verse and concludes his study by saying: "We have to choose between these two [views] in interpreting the end of Mark's gospel as we have it. Either 'he anticipates you into Galilee, and there, in the parousia, you will see him', or 'he is leading you to the Gentiles; it is there you will behold him'."

⁵Cf. Maurice Goguel, Jesus the Nazarene--Myth or History?, trans. by Frederick Stephens (London: T. Fisher Unwin Ltd., 1926), p. 232, who suggests that the disciples left Jerusalem for Galilee with a hope (and probably a certainty) of the resurrection.

suggested that before the Lord left the lake shore He gave the disciples explicit instructions for a future meeting and that He appointed Peter and John to summon the other brethren.⁶ If this were the case, after a few days the news of the gathering would have been circulated and the Eleven and the other disciples would have assembled, possibly on the very mountain where Jesus had formerly delivered His great sermon.⁷ This second appearance of the Lord's post-resurrection ministry in Galilee⁸ played an important rôle because it was here that the unity of the apostolic bond was fully restored after it had been nearly dissolved.⁹

Gospel Parallels

As Matthew related this appearance he spoke only of the Eleven as being present. F. Godet, in seeking to identify Matthew's account

⁶The Risen Master (Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Son, 1901), pp. 278 f. The five hundred are spoken of by Paul not merely as disciples, but as "brethren." They were probably disciples whose fidelity was well known.

⁷Cf. Matt. 28:16. The place and, we may suppose, the time also, had been definitely "appointed." Perhaps the Eleven sat together as a body.

⁸That the appearance to the five hundred was after that to the Seven by the Sea seems to be in accord with John 21:14 when the writer, in speaking of the latter, says: "This was now the third time that Jesus was revealed to the disciples after he was raised from the dead." Cf. C. H. Dodd, "The Appearances of the Risen Christ," op. cit., pp. 22 ff., who points out that many critics think that the miraculous draught of fishes and the call to Peter in Luke 5:1-11 was "originally a post-resurrection narrative, as it is in the Fourth Gospel, and that Luke . . . transplanted the incident into the context of the Ministry--as others have suggested that John transplanted it in the opposite direction."

⁹A. Edersheim, op. cit., pp. 534 f.

with Paul's appearance to the five hundred, says that the writer mentions only the Eleven "because it is with the Commission to the Apostles he is especially concerned."¹⁰ The Lord is directly addressing the Eleven, and it is with the Lord's message rather than incidents, that Matthew is primarily concerned. If we examine Jesus' own intimation regarding the meeting its wider scope is apparent. His summons was directed to His disciples (*ἡ δὲ ὄχλος* , Matt. 28:7, 9), who were not necessarily limited to His Apostles, and though the gathering was especially for the Eleven, it is probable that every person attended who knew of the meeting and who could possibly reach the appointed mountain. Furthermore, if the Lord was planning a meeting with only the Eleven there would have been little need to meet in the hill country. They could have safely met in a room in Capernaum as they had done in Jerusalem.¹¹

There is an implication of the presence of a larger body in the expression "some doubted" (*οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν*).¹² One

¹⁰F. Godet, Commentary on St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, trans. by A. Cusin, II (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1886), pp. 334 f. Cf. also F. H. Chase, op. cit., p. 42. Cf. also E. L. Allen, "The Lost Kerygma," N.T.S., III, No. 4 (July, 1957), p. 353. In speaking of the five hundred, Allen says: "Were these all dead when the Gospels were written? Did none of our evangelists have any contact with even one of their number? If we suppose, as we well may, that this incident is to be located in Galilee, it is not difficult to imagine why it was not taken up into the main stream of tradition."

¹¹H. Latham, op. cit., pp. 289 f.

¹²Matt. 28:17.

would hardly expect to find "some" of the Eleven doubting since they had all been convinced of the Lord's resurrection (Luke 24:36 ff.; John 20:19 ff.). Thomas had been satisfied beyond doubt of the reality of the Risen Christ (John 20:28, 29), and the rest of the disciples had seen Him at least twice (the resurrection day and the following Sunday), or perhaps three times if we assume that this appearance took place after that to the Seven by the Sea of Galilee. One would be less surprised to find doubt among the brethren present in the five hundred who had never seen the resurrected Lord. Latham surmises that the Eleven would already be accustomed to the appearance of the Risen Lord, but that the "brethren," who were not Apostles, would not have been orientated: "Even a slight difference from the Lord's accustomed look might cause them to doubt."¹³

General Observations

Paul says that the "more than five hundred" saw the Lord "at once," or "at one time" (ἐφ' ἑκτάς), thus implying that there were not several separate appearances. It is probable that Paul also intends to imply that more people witnessed this appearance than any other manifestation of the Lord. His statement that the greater part of the five hundred "continue alive" (οἱ πλείονες μένουσιν) has an

¹³Op. cit., p. 292. Cf. B. F. Westcott, op. cit., p. 111. Rengstorff, Die Auferstehung Jesu, pp. 61 f., points out that after Jesus' resurrection He appeared or looked different, and that it was impossible to recognize Him without His help; nor could the disciples enter into communion with Him apart from His help.

apologetic bearing: "The witnesses are still in great numbers, and, if you like, you can go and ask them for yourselves about the resurrection. Even if the Eleven could be deceived, is it credible that their error could have been shared by so large a company?" *ΜΕΝΟΥΣΙΝ* includes the idea of "remaining and waiting" as it looks back to the departure of Christ and forward to His second coming.¹⁴

"But some have fallen asleep" (*ΤΙΝΕΣ ΔΕ*¹⁵ *ἔκοιμήθησαν*). This subordinate statement is added because now, some twenty years afterwards, it is probable that a number of them were no longer alive.¹⁶ The comparatively few (*ΤΙΝΕΣ*), who can no longer bear testimony on this earth to the resurrection, is contrasted with the many (*οἱ πλείονες*) still living. *ἔκοιμήθησαν*, aorist, literally "fell asleep," is a Christian euphemism for "died." The same word is used of Stephen's death (Acts 7:60), and suggests the waking in the resurrection at the last day.

¹⁴T. C. Edwards, A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, 2nd Ed., (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1885), p. 396. For a similar use of *μένω*, cf. John 12:34; 21:22, 23.

¹⁵*ΚΔΙ* ("Byzantine Text") should be omitted since it is not likely to be genuine.

¹⁶A. Meyer, a German critic, attempted to discover, on the basis of statistics, the possibility of the survival of "the greater part" of the five hundred. However, his findings do not disturb Paul's statement. (Noted by W. J. S. Simpson, op. cit., p. 134.)

V: THEN HE APPEARED TO JAMES (VERSE 7A)

Next in order the Lord appeared to James. Most scholars agree that this reference is to the eldest brother of Christ, and, at the time of writing (A. D. 55), it is quite probable that Paul's readers' first thought would have been of James of the Jerusalem Church. If this reference were to the son of Zebedee (who would be included in the appearance to the Twelve) one would expect some qualifying expression, such as "brother of John" (Acts 12:2), to distinguish him from James the brother of the Lord who was still living. Perhaps the principal reason for rejecting the son of Zebedee in preference to James the Lord's brother is the fact that Zebedee's son had been dead for many years (Acts 12:2) and is never mentioned by Paul.¹ *Soule*

Omission of the Appearance in the Gospels

The Gospels make no direct mention of this appearance. We might have expected Luke to have mentioned it since he was a companion of Paul and as such must have heard the Apostle speak of the resurrection appearances. Luke, however, fails to mention this appearance (and that to the

¹T. J. Thorburn, Resurrection Narratives and Modern Criticism (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. Ltd., 1910), p. 33. Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History (Book II, Chap. I) says: "This James therefore whom the ancients on account of the excellency of his virtues, surnamed the Just, was the first that received the Episcopate of the Church at Jerusalem." In the same chapter he goes on to say: "After the resurrection the Lord gave the tradition of knowledge to James the Just"--who, Eusebius explains, is the brother of the Lord.

five hundred), and this is all the more surprising since he was probably familiar with the primitive tradition which Paul cites.² E. L. Allen suggests that it was omitted because the Gentile Church was less favourable to James (the head of the Jerusalem Church) and was not disposed to preserve a tradition concerning him.³ Latham thinks that this appearance was possibly omitted because it took place in Galilee and Luke confines his narrative to the events at Jerusalem.⁴

Though Luke has omitted a definite reference of an appearance to James, he has given us a possible hint of James' conversion, and we may assume, of some manifestation of the Lord to him. In Acts 1:13, 14, he says that the Eleven were assembled in the upper room praying: "All these with one accord devoted themselves to prayer, together with the women and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his [Jesus'] brothers." It is surprising that the Lord's brothers are now in the company of the

²W. J. S. Simpson, op. cit., p. 128. Cf. E. L. Allen, "The Lost Kerygma," op. cit., p. 353: "Paul handed on to his churches what he had received from those who were in faith before him. But this tradition did not come to the men who wrote the Gospels, either by Paul or by any other intermediary. The evangelists, that is to say, did not at this point reduce to writing a tradition that had been handed down to them from the apostles. The process of transmission was one in which fidelity did not exclude selection and interpretation, or even fresh creation. When therefore the church came to commit her message to writing, she not only saw her origins in the light of her subsequent experience, but had also lost some items in her past that might have been of value to her in meeting the needs of her time." E. W. Barnes, The Rise of Christianity, p. 172, insists that Luke could not have heard of Paul's list of resurrection appearances.

³"The Lost Kerygma," op. cit., p. 353.

⁴Op. cit., p. 322.

Apostles because in John 7:5 we learn that they "did not believe in him." If Paul had not related this appearance it would have been difficult to reconcile these two statements. The brothers had little realized the true personality of the Messiah while He was living. It is natural, when we consider it, that the brothers (none of whom could have been much over thirty years old) would have found difficulty in realizing that their brother's nature was essentially different from their own,⁵ and it is unlikely that the Lord's crucifixion brought them to faith. Surely a remarkable change of attitude on the part of the relatives of Jesus took place in the interval between the Passover and Pentecost. James appears to have been the oldest since he is mentioned first of the four in Mark 6:3, and as such he may well have received this manifestation of the Lord as "the natural representative of the family of Jesus."⁶ Latham ventures to suggest that when the Lord appeared to him

⁵Cf. H. Latham, Pastor Pastorum (Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1905), p. 454. We are assuming that the so-called "brethren"--Joses, Judas, and Simon (Mark 6:3)--were actually the sons of Joseph and Mary (the view of Helvidius). See Latham, The Risen Master, pp. 301 ff. For the view that the brothers were sons of Joseph by a former marriage (the "Epiphanian" view) see J. B. Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians (London: Macmillan and Co., 1890), Dissertation II, pp. 252-291. A. Drew, Le mythe de Jésus, pp. 143 ff., holds that the phrase "brethren of the Lord" has reference to a group of Christians distinguished by their piety. In citing this reference, M. Goguel, The Life of Jesus, trans. by Olive Wyon (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1933), p. 117, says: "But if that were so, the brothers of the Lord could not be mentioned as constituting a special group of persons different from the Apostles."

⁶H. B. Swete, The Appearances of Our Lord After the Passion (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1907), p. 87.

there were no words of reproach because of James' late belief. The Lord's interest was now in the future of His disciples and their work, rather than the past.⁷ It may have been on this occasion that the Lord urged James to go to Jerusalem (in the near future) and to bring his brothers with him. It is not improbable that some such direction was given, and this interview affords the only occasion which suggests it.

If James had not received this recognition by the Lord we could not account for the fact that within a few years⁸ he is a recognized "pillar" (*στύλος*) of the church (Gal. 2:9; Acts 12:17; 15:13; 21:18), and ranked with the Apostles (Gal. 1:19; I Cor. 9:5).⁹ Paul possibly learned of this appearance when he visited James in Jerusalem (Gal. 1:18, 19) since it is probable that when they came together they shared their resurrection experiences.

Reference in the Gospel according to the Hebrews

The Gospel according to the Hebrews¹⁰ has an account relative to

⁷Pastor Pastorum, p. 449.

⁸Latham (Ibid., p. 455) suggests ten years. Anton Fridrichsen, "The Apostle and his Message," Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift (Uppsala: A. B. Lundequistska), 1947, No. 3, p. 17, note 7, suggests that after about 34 A. D. James was in Jerusalem.

⁹For James' significant role among the Christians of Jerusalem see Wilfred L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem (Cambridge: University Press, 1925), pp. 81 f.

¹⁰A. Harnack has assigned the date of the Gospel according to the Hebrews to the period 65 (70) to 100 A. D., holding that it probably belongs to the beginning of this period. See Die Chronologie Der Altchristlichen Litteratur Bis Eusebius, Band I (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche, 1897), pp. 625-651, especially p. 650.

this manifestation:

Also the Gospel called according to the Hebrews, lately translated by me into Greek and Latin speech, which Origen often uses, tells, after the resurrection of the Saviour: 'Now the Lord, when he had given the linen cloth unto the servant of the priest, went unto James and appeared to him (for James had sworn that he would not eat bread from that hour wherein he had drunk the Lord's cup until he should see him risen again from among them that sleep)', and again after a little, 'Bring ye, saith the Lord, a table and bread', and immediately it is added, 'He took bread and blessed and brake and gave it unto James the Just and said unto him: My brother, eat thy bread, for the Son of Man is risen from among them that sleep.'¹¹

The incident cannot refer to the Lord's brother, because, as far as we know, he was not present at the Last Supper. If this story has any truth at all, perhaps it refers to James the son of Zebedee. Lightfoot attempts to meet the difficulty by altering the reading: "for James had sworn that he would not eat bread from that hour in which the Lord had drunk the cup (*biberat calicem Dominus*) . . ." Thus Lightfoot seeks to make this refer to the Lord's death (the cup of suffering as in Matthew 20:22, 23; 26:39, 42; Mark 10:38, 39, etc.), rather than to the Last Supper, as would be expected.¹² But the story in either form presupposes that James was a disciple before Jesus' death.

While this apocryphal narrative is intriguing and worth noting, it is clearly to be regarded as a secondary document.¹³ It differs

¹¹ From Jerome's *De Viris Illustribus*, 2. Translated by M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924), pp. 3 f.

¹² *Op. cit.*, p. 274.

¹³ O. Holtzmann, *The Life of Christ*, trans. by J. T. Bealby and

from Paul in making the appearance to James immediately after the resurrection, rather than later; hence its historical accuracy is to be questioned. Nor can James' vow be reconciled with the state of mind of the disciples at the death of the Lord as portrayed in the canonical Gospels.¹⁴ The description of the attendant circumstances is hardly credible, and thus this account need not be further considered.

General Observations

This appearance would have a special significance for the Church at Corinth because James' authority, as brother of the Lord and leader of the Jerusalem Church, was not inferior to that of the Twelve. In spite of his past unbelief, he now exerted a profound influence upon his contemporaries.¹⁵

Assuming that this appearance is in its proper chronological order, it would seem that the Lord appeared to James a short time after the manifestation to the five hundred and sometime before the day of the Ascension. Because of Paul's statement, "Then [ἔπειτα] he

M. A. Canney (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1904), p. 51, claims the Gospel according to the Hebrews as a primary authority--as far as its fragments go--parallel in historical value to the Synoptics. Among English writers (Lightfoot, Westcott, and Salmon) the tendency has been to discredit the work as a late product.

¹⁴R. W. Macon, The Resurrection of Jesus Christ (London: Williams and Norgate, 1877), p. 57. See also J. T. Dodd, The Gospel According to the Hebrews (London: The Search Publishing Co., 1933), pp. 19 ff.; C. H. Dodd, "The Appearances of the Risen Christ," op. cit., p. 21.

¹⁵However, cf. E. L. Allen, op. cit., p. 353.

appeared to James," it is probable that this was James' first sight of the Risen Lord since he had not been in the company of the five hundred. This belief is further supported by the fact that Paul speaks of the five hundred not merely as disciples, but as "brethren" (ἀδελφοί). followers of long standing.¹⁶ From the evidence that we have, James could hardly be thought of as such.

¹⁶Cf. Latham, The Risen Master, pp. 319 f.

VI: THEN TO ALL THE APOSTLES (VERSE 7B)

This appearance likely took place after the Apostles had returned to Jerusalem from Galilee. We are not told the exact reason for their return, but conceivably the Lord directed them to return even as He had instructed them to go to Galilee.¹ Then too, it is very likely that the disciples returned having the feast of Pentecost in mind.² Godet suggests that Luke's expressions in Acts 1:4, 6 (καὶ συνελθόντες. "And having assembled with"; and then οἱ μὲν οὖν συνεβόησαν, "they, therefore, having come together") add weight to the suggestion that their return was the result of a positive convocation on the part of Jesus.³ Now that their faith was restored

¹E. F. Scott, The First Age of Christianity (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1926), p. 114, says: "They came there [Jerusalem] most likely in the confidence that their master was to return almost immediately as the triumphant Messiah, and would suddenly appear, as prophecy had foretold, in the temple (Malachi 3:1)." E. Von Dobschütz, The Apostolic Age, pp. 15 f., and Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, pp. 265 f., hold a similar view. Bultmann (Theology of the New Testament, I, p. 37) thinks that they went to take over the reign of the Kingdom. Ernest Renan, The Apostles (London: Mathieson & Co., 1889), p. 25, assumes that something of an organization already existed at the time when he suggests that "The return to Jerusalem was then resolved upon by those who at that time had the direction of the sect."

²Cf. C. F. D. Moule, op. cit., pp. 58-61.

³F. Godet, Commentary on St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, II, pp. 337 f. Cf. Moule, op. cit., p. 60. He suggests that the alternate reading συνελθόντες is to be preferred and that the reference has to do with the temporary festival lodging in the environs of Jerusalem. Cf. also Cullmann (Early Christian Worship, 16) who suggests that the expression συνελθόντες means more pre-

the disciples probably were eager to return to Jerusalem (from whence they had set out in despair)⁴ to carry the good news of the resurrection.⁵

The Meaning of Ἀπόστολοι

Paul here makes a definite distinction between the appearance to the Twelve and that to the Apostles. The addition of πάντων confirms the view that τοῖς δώδεκα of verse 5 is official and not numerical. The meaning is that Christ appeared to the whole body of apostles, thus indicating a larger circle than the Twelve.⁶ There is not sufficient evidence to insist that Paul is using ἀπόστολοι in its narrow sense here.⁷ In Acts 1:21, 22, Luke refers to those who had

cisely "He took salt with them." So also A. J. B. Higgins, The Lord's Supper in the New Testament (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 6), London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1952, p. 62.

⁴Gospel of Peter (59) says: "But we, the twelve disciples of the Lord, were weeping and were in sorrow, and each one being grieved for that which had befallen departed unto his own house." Translated by M. R. James, op. cit., p. 94.

⁵In addition to this reason for the return of the disciples, Goguel (The Birth of Christianity, p. 59) thinks that there was an idea that Jesus would return to Jerusalem because he had died there.

⁶Cf. Johannes Munck, "Paul, the Apostles, and the Twelve," Studia Theologica, III, No. 1-2 (1949), p. 105; Wilfred L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, p. 177, note 31.

⁷For the view that ἀπόστολοι is used in its limited meaning, see J. MacRory, op. cit., p. 229. K. Holl, as cited by Holger Mosbeck, "Apostolos in the New Testament," Studia Theologica, II, No. 1-2 (1948), p. 180, thinks that the only difference between οἱ δώδεκα and οἱ ἀπόστολοι πάντες is that the latter term comprises "the twelve" plus James, the brother of the Lord as well. However, as Mosbeck points out, this view is not convincing and is very unlikely.

accompanied the Eleven "beginning from the baptism of John until the day when he was taken up from us," and this would seem to justify the inference which Paul's language suggests. Thus Matthias and Justus (whom Luke goes on to mention in Acts 1:23), James and Barnabas (who sometime bear the title of apostles, Gal. 1:19; I Cor. 9:5; Acts 14:14, 14), Cleopas and his companion, and others, may well have been present at this appearance.

Relation of the Appearance to the Ascension

This Pauline resurrection appearance is to be identified with the manifestation of Christ before the Ascension.⁸ Jerusalem, the capital of the old theocracy, the scene of the passion and resurrection, was chosen as the site of His last major appearing. Professor Swete makes the suggestion that there were possibly two separate appearances immediately before the Ascension: Luke 24:44-46 (or 47) referring to the Sunday before the Ascension, and 24:47-53 to the day of Ascension.⁹ At the first appearance the disciples received instructions on two matters: the fulfilment of the Scriptures in the passion and resurrection of Christ; and practical instructions for their immediate conduct. Swete thinks that the second appearance took place in the upper room, which the disciples had secured as a meeting place, and from there the Lord led His followers out of the city to a place "near the Bethany road,

⁸ Luke 24:50 ff.; Acts 1:6-11; Mark 16:19-20.

⁹ See H. B. Swete, op. cit., pp. 93-104.

about half way between Bethany and Jerusalem, sufficiently remote from both, and yet within the sight of the former."¹⁰ After giving them final instructions, He blessed them, and was received up into heaven.

Opinions differ as to the arrangements of the materials. For example, Latham thinks that there were probably three separate appearances immediately before the Ascension, each occurring on successive days.¹¹ One may feel that these attempts of the division of the Lucan narrative are but mere conjecture, but in their defence it should be pointed out that Luke's Gospel runs together into one narrative the happenings and sayings which, no doubt, belong to separate occasions. Indeed, one could read the whole of Luke's compressed account of the resurrection appearances and be led to think that Christ was raised and ascended on the same day.¹² But, of course, Luke does not intend to give this impression, as he plainly states in Acts 1:3 that the Lord "presented himself alive after his passion by many proofs, appearing to them during forty days."¹³

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Luke 24:44-48, the first meeting; 24:50-53 and Acts 1:4, 5, the second; and 24:50-53 and Acts 1:6-11, the third. See H. Latham, The Risen Master, pp. 340 ff.

¹²However, there are faint marks of breaks; for example, καὶ ἰδοὺ δὺν ἐξ αὐτῶν (vs. 13), ταῦτα δὲ αὐτῶν (vs. 36), εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς (vs. 44), ἐξ ἡμετέρων δὲ αὐτοὺς (vs. 50). The RSV recognizes these breaks by paragraph marks.

¹³Cf. Moule, op. cit., p. 60: "The narrative in Luke xxiv. 34-53 will then have to be divided, as Acts i implies, into two incidents,

Whatever the case may be, Paul is writing these verses to say that the Lord was witnessed by different sets of people. Whether the same group saw Him once, twice, or three times, the matter is probably secondary since the Corinthians would be more interested in the people who made up the various witnessing bodies, than concerned about the occasion and order of the appearances.

one just after Passover, one just before Pentecost; it must be assumed (in the old-fashioned way) that Luke did not know of the forty days tradition until he had finished the Gospel--unless, with Menoud we regard Luke xxiv and Acts i as having both suffered interpolation."

VII: LAST OF ALL HE APPEARED TO ME (VERSE 8)

perhaps
 The last of the appearances mentioned by Paul is his own, which probably took place in A. D. 32.¹ The Apostle does not give us a detailed story here, but the indirect references to it in his epistles show that the churches knew of the circumstances of this appearance and of Paul's resulting conversion (cf. I Cor. 9:1; 15:8; Gal. 1:16; Phil. 3:7, 8). Nor do we find any account of this manifestation in the Gospels, but we are fortunate in that one of the Gospel writers, Luke, gives us three accounts of this momentous event: one is by the author of the book; the other two are attributed by him to Paul.² Schmiedel has pointed out the discrepancies of the three accounts,³ but these divergencies have to do with details rather than the substance of the narrative. These details are concerned more with the subjective impression which the experience is said to have made upon the bystanders than with anything else. In brief, we learn that Paul and his party are on the road to Damascus to persecute the church. As they travel along,

¹Paul's conversion, at the time of this appearance, took place not long after the death of Christ. Lightfoot dates it six or seven years after the crucifixion, but the trend of later criticism is to place the event within a year or two of the death, as do Harnack, McGiffert, and Moffatt. Cf. C. H. Turner, "Chronology in the New Testament," Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, I, p. 424.

²Acts 9:3-8; 22:6-11; 26:12-18.

³P. W. Schmiedel, op. cit., col. 4063. See T. J. Thorburn, op. cit., pp. 69 ff., for a discussion of the problem and an answer to Schmiedel.

both Paul and his companions are blinded by a dazzling light. Paul falls to the ground and hears the Lord's reproachful voice: "Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?" He is then directed to go to Damascus where he would learn what he should do.

By the first words ἔτχ_ατο_ν δὲ π_λν_τω_ν Paul seems to indicate not only that this appearance to him came after the others, but that it was the close of the resurrection appearances in general.⁴ π_λν_τω_ν probably refers to all the individuals mentioned in the foregoing verse.⁵ Paul's later life shows that he had many visions and revelations of the Lord (Acts 18:9 f.; 22:17 ff.; II Cor. 12), but this expression (ἔτχ_ατο_ν δὲ π_λν_τω_ν) makes it clear that he places his later visions in a different category from this appearance which caused his conversion.⁶

⁴Cf. R. J. Knowling, The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ, 2nd Ed. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1906), pp. 182 f.; Gustav W. Stählin, "On the Third Day," op. cit., p. 294.

⁵This assumes that π_λν_τω_ν is masculine, therefore referring to the ἀποστόλοι . If it is neuter, C. J. Elliott, St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1887), p. 291, suggests that it could be an adverbial expression, like π_λν_τω_ν καλῶ_ς τε . The masculine reference is to be preferred because of the context.

⁶See B. Weiss, op. cit., III, p. 413. With similar care and penetration Luke distinguishes between Stephen's vision of Christ, and Christ's appearance to Paul. The latter is clearly thought of as external in a way that the former is not. No suggestion of impressions shared by the bystanders occurs in Stephen's vision. Maurice Goguel, Jesus the Nazarene, pp. 221 f., thinks that the difference between the first appearances and the later ones consists only in one aspect: "... the later ones are not, like the first, the creative source of belief in the resurrection and the apostolic vocation."

Relation of the Appearance to Paul's Apostleship

With deep humility Paul says that the Lord appeared to him "as unto one untimely born" ($\tau\acute{\omega}^7 \epsilon\kappa\tau\rho\omega\mu\alpha\tau\iota$). Some think that this allusion is to the violence and suddenness of Paul's conversion. Perhaps this meaning is involved, but the following verse (vs. 9) seems to put the emphasis on his abnormal calling to the apostleship. Saul was spiritually immature and wholly unprepared to see Christ or to be an Apostle when the Lord appeared and gave him new life.⁸ The other Apostles' calling had been more gradual and they had had ample time to detach themselves from their inherited Judaism. Paul, however, had had no preparation by contact with the earthly Jesus, but was torn as by a violent operation from his mother religion. The Apostle was also "untimely born" in that his experience had taken place so long after the others had seen the Lord. The article $\tau\acute{\omega}$ can be significant in that $\tau\acute{o} \epsilon\kappa\tau\rho\omega\mu\alpha$ could well have been an insulting reproach used by some of the strict Jewish Christians.⁹ Paul adopts the title and shows that his apostleship is as valid as that of the older Apostles.

⁷The reading $\tau\acute{\omega}$ is preferable to the alternate $\tau\psi (= \tau\iota\kappa\iota')$ because of context and usage (A. Robertson and A. Plummer, op. cit., p. 339).

⁸In pointing out the dominance of God the Father in Paul's apostolic consciousness, Professor Karl H. Rengstorff, Apostleship (Bible Key Words from Gerhard Kittel's T.W.N.T.), London: Adam and Charles Black, 1952, p. 55, says that the primary cause of what happened was not Christ, but God, though it was certainly Christ who met and spoke to the Apostle.

⁹Cf. F. Godet, St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, p. 339.

despite his abnormality and unworthiness (vss. 9, 10). The position of *καὶ μοί* at the end makes it emphatic: "to me also."

Nature of the Appearance

What was the nature of this appearance? Because of the voluminous quantity of literature on the subject we cannot exhaustively consider each investigator. In the main, the negative criticism¹⁰ has maintained that this appearance was a subjective one of a visionary character, and as the result of Paul's psychological conditioning. Verses, such as II Corinthians 12:1-9 and Galatians 1:15 f., have been cited to show the inward character of the revelation. And because Paul uses the same word (*ὥφθον*) in describing his experience as that of the disciples, some scholars maintain that Paul must have thought of these earlier appearances as like his own, "spiritual visions."¹¹ Moreover, it is thought that the more materialistic accounts of the manifestations in the Gospels are the outcome of later unhistorical embellishments.¹²

The more positive critics¹³ point out the suddenness and objec-

¹⁰Baur, Holsten, Strauss, Pfleiderer, Renan, James, Schmiedel, A. Neumann, Eck, A. Meyer, Montefiore, Goguel, et al. Baur later recognized the inadequacy of his subjective explanation of Paul's conversion. See W. J. S. Simpson, op. cit., pp. 153 ff.; William H. Ryder, "The Recent Literature upon the Resurrection of Christ," H.T.R., II, No. 1 (Jan., 1909), pp. 1-27.

¹¹Weizsäcker, op. cit., pp. 8 f.

¹²Cf. Goguel, The Birth of Christianity, p. 59. Vide infra for a consideration of this final problem.

¹³Schwartzkopff, Swete, Lake, Knowling, et al.

tivity of the Apostle's experience, arguing that his conversion was not the result of the memory (under strong excitement) of the vision of Stephen. It does seem clear that in Paul's case there was no predisposition to see Christ or to hear intelligible words when others understood only a disconcerted sound. And if it is argued that Paul for a long time previous to his conversion had been repressing the voice of conscience by his more ardent persecution of the church, it can only be said that his own testimony denies it. He often speaks of how he persecuted the church (I Cor. 15:9; Gal. 1:13) but he never states that he was violating his conscience.¹⁴ Perhaps one could speculate and say that the Apostle was "unconsciously" repressing his conscience, but as far as all evidence shows, he was still a convinced disbeliever in the Christ-sect down to the moment of his conversion. With no hesitation or uncertainty, he acted as a man convinced of the truth of Judaism and the falsity of Christianity.

But in saying that the Apostle's experience was not the result of psychological conditioning we do not mean to imply that there was no room for psychological preparation. Otherwise, as Pfleiderer observes, his conversion would be a "magical act of God, in which the soul of Paul would have succumbed to an alien force."¹⁵ Certainly his experience did not

¹⁴The writer in I Timothy 1:13 says that he was a persecutor but that he "acted ignorantly in unbelief." This cannot be insisted upon, however, as evidence for the Apostle's life because the Pauline authorship of I Timothy is doubtful.

¹⁵Otto Pfleiderer, Lectures on the Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity, trans. by J. F. Smith (London:

take place in a vacuum as certain of his own words indicate. Passages, such as Galatians 1:1, 12, 15 f. and II Corinthians 4:6, show the subjective side of Paul's conversion, but they do not make the case a purely inward one, because every conversion involves an inner experience. It is interesting to note that certain critics of the negative school acknowledge that Paul's expression *ἐν ἑμοί* (Gal. 1:16) does not necessarily contradict the external character of the appearances.¹⁶ Paul's sensitive nature must have been aware of the courageous loyalty and the triumphant joy of the new sect of the Nazarene, but there is no indication that he was seized by remorse, or haunted by a suspicion that he was fighting against the truth.¹⁷

Further Significance of *ὥφθον*

Paul classes his appearance of the Lord with the appearances during the forty days because he uses the same word (*ὥφθον*) in reference to both. As was stated above, this verb is sometimes used in connection with visions, but it is used equally of seeing which is not visionary, and in almost every case there is the idea of something sudden or unexpected.¹⁸

Williams and Norgate, 1885), p. 34. Cf. J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, I, pp. 29 f.

¹⁶ Cf. Arnold Meyer, Die Auferstehung Christi (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1905), p. 186; O. Holtzmann, op. cit., p. 501, footnote No. 2.

¹⁷ Cf. J. M. Shaw, The Resurrection of Christ, pp. 42 ff.

¹⁸ James Denney, Jesus and the Gospel (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908), p. 116. M. Goguel, Jesus the Nazarene, p. 221, suggests that *ὥφθον* is used with the dative to show that the initiative belonged to Jesus rather than to the disciples. He states: "... the expression

In itself the verb does not help us to define the experience with precision, but as Paul is seeking to demonstrate the bodily resurrection, it is to be thought of in the sense "was seen." Professor G. H. C. Macgregor insists that nothing less than a real objective appearance could have had the result that it did.¹⁹ He thinks that what Paul (and the other disciples) saw was an "objective vision," which, as he recognizes, some²⁰ think of as a contradiction of terms.

Yet an objective vision there surely must have been, at least in the sense that the initiative came from Christ, so that what the disciples saw was no mere projection of their own imagination, a product of the mental condition of the seer. . . Personally I believe that Peter first, and later the rest of the disciples, not only saw a vision of Jesus, but what they saw was Jesus, in some special supernatural manifestation, 'in true spirit form or in some kind of acquired visibility' (Enc. Bibl.).²¹

which Paul uses must not be pushed to the point of reducing the apparitions in his thought to simple visions, with no reality outside the consciousness of those who were favored with them."

¹⁹"The Growth of the Resurrection Faith," Part II, E.T., L, No. 6 (March, 1939), p. 283.

²⁰E. g. Goguel, La Foi a la Résurrection de Jésus dans le Christianisme Primitif, p. 397.

²¹"The Growth of the Resurrection Faith," Part II, op. cit., p. 283. Macgregor thinks that the Damascus experience is not to be differentiated in any way from his later visions mentioned in II Cor. 12:1. See Part I, E.T., L, No. 5 (Feb., 1939), p. 218. Gustaf Aulén, The Faith of the Christian Church, trans. by Eric H. Wahlstrom and G. Everett Arden (Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1948), pp. 248 f., says that what is significant is that Christ was raised from the dead by an act of God. He states: "Since this is essential, the problems which would compel us to choose between 'subjectivity' or 'objectivity' of these visions are eliminated. Neither of these obscure terms expresses the characteristic viewpoint of faith. If 'objectivity' should here mean that the resurrection can be demonstrated as any other empirical fact, it would be contrary both to the primitive Christian testimony of faith according to which the risen Christ manifested himself to his own, but

Paul always believed that he had seen the Risen Lord in the same sense as had the other Apostles between the day of the resurrection and the Ascension.²² He thought of himself as the last of these witnesses, and this "seeing" he regarded as the basis and justification of his apostolic mission.²³

If one examines the Pauline passages concerning the resurrection it is obvious that Paul did not believe that the body he saw on the road to Damascus was the identical body (made of the same material and subject to the same conditions) that had been nailed to the cross. In his thinking the resurrection was not the resumption of the material life which had been interrupted by the drama of Calvary; rather it is Christ's entry into divine glory. He says in this very chapter (I Cor. 15) that the human body (that is, $\tauὰρξ$ καὶ δῖμῶς) cannot enter upon heavenly life. It must be transformed--changed in its attributes and properties.

not to a Caiaphas, a Herod, or a Pilate; and also to the present Christian experience which affirms that faith alone has fellowship with the exalted and glorified Christ. In this sense we are dealing with something 'subjective,' since it is not a question of an empirical verification but of an affirmation of faith. The whole sequence of exaltation, however, possesses at the same time the greatest possible objectivity, since faith asserts that this sequence is an act of almighty God through which the completed work of Christ manifests its power in his continuous activity and his reign is thus extended (Rom. 1:4; 4:25)."

²²H. A. A. Kennedy, St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1904), p. 83.

²³I Cor. 9:1. Rengstorff (Apostleship, p. 54) states: "It is thus clear that Paul's apostolic consciousness is completely dominated by his encounter with Jesus on the way to Damascus."



This appearance completes Paul's official list. The fact that the manifestations ceased after that to the Apostle is against the theory of hallucinations, for if all the appearances had been but mere delusions they would probably have continued, due to their infectious nature. From the above it is evident that the faith of the Apostle Paul is only understandable on the basis of his encounter with the Risen Jesus. It was not until after this resurrection experience that he was prepared to accept the fact of Jesus' resurrection and to proclaim this kerygmatic statement of the resurrection faith.

VIII: CONCLUSION

It is hardly possible to exaggerate the importance of Paul's list of resurrection witnesses. There could be no doubt about the significance and trustworthiness of the Twelve, the five hundred, or of all the apostles, and Peter and James were, at the time of writing, two of the outstanding disciples of the Christian community. It is also important to notice that two of the witnesses cited in the list, James and Paul himself, had previously been unbelievers. Of the appearances not mentioned by the Apostle, the testimony of the women would not count for much in the mind of the Jew, nor was it even believed at first. Then too, as far as we know, Cleopas and his companion were not men of special importance.

These appearances recorded by Paul, as we have presented them, may thus be regarded as closely corresponding to the Gospel accounts (excepting, as we have noted, the appearance to James).¹ Both Paul and the Gospel Evangelists were convinced that Christ had been raised from the dead and that He had appeared to certain persons. The evidence underlying this belief is consistent in both the Gospel and the Pauline accounts, though none of the writers has attempted to give a complete

¹The author has been aware of the ever-present danger of forcing identification between the two, and of the past judgment of some scholars that the accounts cannot be reconciled. Cf. J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, I, pp. 15 ff.; G. Stählin, "On the Third Day," op. cit., p. 295.

harmony of the various appearances. The fact that the resurrection narratives were not forced into a thorough-going harmony and that they frequently take for granted important details does not mean that the New Testament writers were unreasonably credulous; rather their immediate situation did not demand a sharply critical approach. Also to be taken into consideration is the fact that Paul and each of the Gospel writers wrote of this momentous event from his own standpoint of interest. It is as though one were to question five men who had experienced an earthquake. In their several accounts there would probably be any number of differences and inconsistencies as to how it happened, but all five would be perfectly certain about the earthquake itself.

Thus it is not a question of the accuracy of one tradition as over against another, and certainly not one of the historicity of the resurrection story itself. What alone made the first disciples Christians was their belief that their Master's resurrection was a fact--something that had actually happened. If they had not believed it to be an actual fact of history they would never have been Christians themselves, nor would they have had either the desire or the power in a single generation to make converts to their faith.² In speaking of Paul's resurrection faith Wilfred Knox says:

In the first place his faith depends entirely on the Resurrection of our Lord as a historic fact. Although his own personal experience would no doubt have satisfied himself, yet he realizes that it

²Cf. Wilfred Knox, St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem (Cambridge: University Press, 1925), p. 146.

would be worthless if the fact of the Resurrection could not be proved by the evidence of eyewitnesses.³

Several scholars, such as Weiss and Macgregor, have expressed the view that Paul's understanding of the resurrection appearances (and of Christ's resurrection body--vide infra) is less materialistic than that of the Gospels. They believe that the primary tradition is one of "glorification" whereas the view of the Gospels, particularly the Synoptics, is a more materialistic concept of "reanimation," in which Jesus appears in a more tangible manner to His disciples. Thus Paul is thought to represent the Risen Christ as a glorified and exalted being who is alive in heaven and who appears to His disciples.

There is simply not one trace in St. Paul of the now-common idea, derived from the Gospels and the Book of Acts, that through his resurrection Jesus returned to the conditions of earthly life; not one trace of the idea that he ate and drank with his disciples; or that he simply resumed the physical body of flesh which hitherto he had occupied. In other words, when Paul speaks of the resurrection, he is not thinking of a purely physical resuscitation and return into the earthly life; for him Jesus' resurrection means the same thing as his glorification and exaltation.⁴

Likewise, in his summary statement of his article, Professor Macgregor concludes:

Faith in the Risen Christ was thus at first a simple affirmation of His exaltation to the rank of Messiah and Lord, and was quite independent of any stress upon the material reanimation of the body. This is a secondary emphasis born of the necessity of apologetics. It was only later that the material side of the Resurrection became in itself an object of belief, and was constituted the chief proof

³Ibid.

⁴J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, I, p. 84. Cf. E. von Dobschütz, The Apostolic Age, p. 16.

or 'sign' of the verity of the Christian faith.⁵

Paul's view, as well as that represented by Peter in his speeches in Acts, is thought of as the prior affirmation and independent of the later view.

We must agree with these interpreters that Paul's emphasis is more "spiritual" than that of the Gospels. He does not mention the Risen Jesus' passing through the closed door, eating, and inviting Himself to be touched, as Weiss has pointed out. But while this is so, it does not imply that the Apostle did not believe in a "bodily resurrection" or that he would necessarily reject the Gospels' presentation.⁶ Certainly in the light of the whole purpose of I Corinthians 15 we must say that the difference in Paul's presentation from that of the Gospels is one of emphasis and not one of principle. Nor is there any justification in pushing this emphasis to the extreme of saying that Paul believed in a mere "spiritual" resurrection and that the Gospels present a "material" resurrection; or that the Apostle thought of the appearances as mere visions while the Gospel Evangelists drew no distinction in the post-

⁵"The Growth of the Resurrection Faith," Part I, op. cit., p. 220. Cf. pp. 217 ff. Macgregor (p. 219) does not overlook the fact that all accounts of the resurrection (New Testament and non-canonical) have the spiritual point of view along with the idea of "reanimation." Thus "reanimation" never appears alone. See F. B. Westbrook, "The Resurrection Narratives," E.T., LI, No. 6 (March, 1940), pp. 277-282, where he defends the view that the alleged inconsistency does not exist in anything like the manner Dr. Macgregor would urge. Cf. also Ch. Guignebert, Jesus, trans. by S. H. Hooke (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., 1935), p. 529.

⁶Vide infra, pp. 229 ff.

resurrection appearances from His flesh-and-blood presence during His earthly ministry.

While closely corresponding to the appearances in I Corinthians 15, the Gospel accounts are later (though, of course, they represent early traditions) and independent of Paul's. Dr. Dodd says:

It appears, then, that the narratives in the Gospels were not produced as expansion, by way of commentary or 'midrash', of the list of appearances in the primitive tradition; while it is quite certain that the list was not compiled out of the Gospels.⁷

They are independent of one another and "represent alternative methods of supplementing the simple statements of the kerygma in its baldest form, that Christ rose from the dead. . ."⁸ Also, it seems clear that the task of the Apostle was not that of the Gospel writers. Paul mentions the appearances only in passing in his endeavour to convince the Corinthians of the significance of the resurrection for themselves. It was not his task either to prove the truth of the resurrection of Christ or to give a detailed list of all the factors in the story, as if he were telling it to the Corinthians for the first time.

It seems evident that the Gospel writers were faced with presenting an apologetic against the resurrection sceptics. In emphasizing this

⁷"The Appearances of the Risen Christ," op. cit., p. 29.

⁸Ibid. Dr. Dodd says this in relating I Cor. 15 with Luke 24. Macgregor ("The Growth of the Resurrection Faith," Part I, op. cit., p. 220) reasons that the Gospel accounts are later because it is difficult to suppose that apologists would have made the gospel more difficult of acceptance by a popular audience by sublimating and spiritualizing their presentation of an originally materialistic resurrection story.

truth, L. B. Cross states:

The writers of the Synoptic Gospels are interested only in providing evidence such as they thought proved the resurrection to have been a well-authenticated fact foretold by Jesus; they are not interested in its significance. St. Paul, and the compiler of Acts, pay little attention to events, but the fact of the resurrection and its significance are central in their writings. The author of the Fourth Gospel attempts, not too successfully, to harmonize these two points of view.⁹

While we cannot agree with this view that the Synoptic Gospels were interested "only" in the apologetic motif, it does seem that this was a dominating factor in the Gospels' presentation of the resurrection.

In this connection it is to be noted that Paul does not emphasize the empty tomb as do the Gospel accounts. Because Paul has not made explicit mention of it in I Corinthians 15, some interpreters, such as Goguel, think that the most ancient tradition assumes that the disciples had no knowledge of the fact of the empty tomb; thus the appearances were independent of the discovery of the empty tomb.¹⁰ In basic agreement with Goguel, McCasland says that the belief in the empty tomb "came as a

⁹"Jesus: His Resurrection and Ascension," The Modern Churchman, XXXVI, Nos. 4, 5 & 6 (Sept., 1946), p. 195. Mr. Cross goes on to say: "Had it not been for the significance which St. Paul, the Acts, and to a less extent the Fourth Gospel attach to the resurrection, the Synoptic account of it would hardly have assumed the importance now attached to them" (p. 204). In relating John and Paul, Anton Fridrichsen, "Jesus, St John and St Paul," The Root of the Vine, by A. Fridrichsen et al. (London: Dacre Press, 1953), pp. 49 f., states: "St John is independent of St Paul . . . His interest is anti-Gnostic, and his main purpose is to show the unity between the risen, glorified Lord and the Word that was made flesh, the Jesus of Galilee and Jerusalem." Cf. G. Baldensperger, Le Tombeau Vide: La Légende et L'histoire (Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan, 1935), pp. 73-75.

¹⁰Jesus the Nazarene, pp. 233 ff., 240.

secondary production, probably as an apologetic against the Jewish skeptics of the resurrection.¹¹ But many scholars have shown that this view is not necessarily the case.¹² There was not the need for Paul to mention the empty tomb that was later the necessity for the Gospel writers. The Apostle no doubt believed in the empty tomb from his statement in I Corinthians 15:3 f. that Christ "died," "was buried," and "was raised." Surely this verse testifies to the place of the empty tomb in the early preaching of the church.¹³

In the Apostle's formula in I Corinthians 15 he is endeavouring to meet any objector by defining more precisely the source of information so as to put any doubter (in theory at least) in a position to question the living witnesses.¹⁴ Later, the Evangelists expand the

¹¹The Resurrection of Jesus, p. 45, cf. pp. 172 ff.

¹²Cf. A. M. Ramsey, The Resurrection of Christ, pp. 42-44, 50-55, 71-73; Gustav W. Stählin, "On the Third Day," op. cit., pp. 285 ff.; Francis B. Westbrook, "The Resurrection Narratives," op. cit., pp. 277-282; G. H. C. Macgregor, "The Growth of the Resurrection Faith," Part I, op. cit., pp. 280 f.

¹³Cf. Beasley Murray, Christ Is Alive!, p. 42. The author also points out (p. 41) that in his sermon at Antioch of Pisidia, Paul quotes Psalm 16:10 ("Thou wilt not let thy Holy One see corruption.") and that Paul distinguishes between the death of David and that of Christ (cf. Acts 13:35-37). He states: "This insistence of Jesus seeing no corruption, in distinction from David, must mean that the body of Jesus left the tomb. This is stated with unmistakable clarity in verses 29 and 30: 'When they had fulfilled all things that were written of Him, they took Him down from the tree, and laid Him in a tomb. But God raised Him from the dead.' The resurrection involved the taking of the body out of the grave, and the mention of the tomb is made for the purpose of underlining the reality of both the death and resurrection of the Lord. If he was laid in a tomb He went to the extremity of death; if He left it He completely conquered death."

¹⁴Dodd, "The Appearances of the Risen Christ," op. cit., p. 30.

resurrection narratives in an attempt to meet the objection that the Apostles may have had insufficient grounds for making the claims they had made.¹⁵ E. L. Allen sums this up by saying: "Thus, while the kerygma of I Cor. xv was shaped in a missionary church still under the power of the great event, the Gospels served the needs of a church that had to defend itself against criticism which had come down to her from the past."¹⁶

As the modern thinker undertakes to correlate these appearances he must bear in mind that the writers were faced with radically different circumstances from those which we face today. It was not necessary for the Apostle to give an exact sequence of time and minute description of the manifestations in view of the fact that the Corinthians were familiar with the resurrection evidence. Thus, we do not find the kind of evidence which modern critics desire because it could not possibly have seemed necessary to the early Christians. Many of them had seen the Risen Christ and this fact was real in their lives, and conceivably because they expected a speedy return of the Lord, it never occurred to them to leave a carefully documented record for those centuries later. It is therefore

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶"The Lost Kerygma," op. cit., p. 351. Cf. p. 352 where Allen states the main thesis of his paper, "that the Gospel narratives of the Resurrection are governed by another set of needs and meet another situation than those of the first kerygma--is not dependent on any decision as to the historicity of the former."

unfair and impossible for us to treat these writings as though they could take the place of the kind of evidence which would be required by modern critics.¹⁷

It may be impossible by any method of investigation now known to us to establish with precision all the details of the resurrection story, or to determine whether the witnesses correctly interpreted their experiences, but we can be certain that they believed that Christ had been raised. This is the only plausible explanation of the sudden change in their minds from dismay and terror to confidence and boldness. When all the questions have been raised, and every shadow of doubt given its fullest weight, what cannot be questioned is that the disciples were genuinely convinced that they had been in contact with the Risen Jesus.

¹⁷See A. M. Ramsey, The Resurrection of Christ, p. 67.

PART II

THE CHRISTOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESURRECTION

BOSTON

EXTRA STRONG

THE CHRISTOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESURRECTION

Introduction

The full Apostolic understanding of the Person of Christ began not with prophecy, Jesus' birth, His baptism, His ministry, nor His cross, but rather with His resurrection. The appearances of the Risen Christ were the undeniable fact that rallied the disciples, restored their confidence, and gave them a message to proclaim. The resurrection was their interpretative principle as they endeavoured to fathom the mystery of Jesus. It was the climactic event in their Saviour's life, and it not only revealed to them an understanding of Jesus' earthly course, but it revealed as well the definitive status of the One that God had exalted. In their interpretation of the Resurrected and Exalted Jesus lay the seed of the church's dogma of the Person of Christ. As we shall see, the resurrection revealed Him as the Christ, the Lord, the Son of God, and the Last Adam.

I: THE CHRIST

Immediately after the resurrection there was little thought in the minds of the disciples that Jesus had been the founder of a new religion. They continued to hope that Jesus would restore the kingdom to Israel (Acts 1:6; cf. Luke 24:21), because, to them, the idea of two chosen peoples was an impossible one. They thought of Jesus as One who had been fully loyal to their heritage (Matt. 5:17) and not as One intending to secede from Judaism. Thus the church appears as a religious group within the Jewish community. So far as we know, its members were all either born Jews or proselytes to Judaism, and like other members of the synagogue, they took part in regular worship in the Temple, observed the Jewish festivals, and in general kept the Mosaic Law. Thus at first the primitive community did not split off from Judaism as though it were conscious of itself as a new religious society. They thought of Jesus' work as a stage in the history of Judaism, and for them the sacred institutions still remained in force. In the eyes of their contemporaries they must have looked like a sect within Judaism. According to Acts they were favourably regarded by much of the populace of Jerusalem, and the converts they won included both priests and adherents of the sect of the Pharisees.¹ Although the disciples did form themselves into a separate community, for some time they strove to maintain their connection

¹Acts 2:47; 4:4; 5:14; 6:7; 15:5.

with Judaism in spite of all repulses.²

But the one thing which separated them from the ordinary belief of their countrymen and made them more than a Jewish sect was the fact that the Risen Jesus was recognized and proclaimed as the *Xpīstōs*, the Anointed One.³ This single difference, however, was crucial and proved to be the germ that contained the whole future development of Christianity. Indeed, they claimed that this belief marked them out as Israel's true representative, the faithful "remnant." God had chosen Israel to be His people and had promised them a salvation which would be wrought at the appointed time by the coming Messiah. This hope had been central in the religion of Israel, and it was now seen to have been fulfilled in the Risen Jesus. The disciples became the new community of Jesus the Messiah and they spoke of themselves as followers of this new "way."⁴ Those who believed in Him were therefore the true Israel, and the Jewish nation was thought of as the schismatic body, which, in its rejection of the Messiah, had itself been rejected.

JESUS' MESSIAHSHIP AND HIS RESURRECTION

It is clear from the Gospels that the crucifixion of Jesus had

²Cf. E. von Dobschütz, The Apostolic Age, pp. 20 ff.; T. G. Jalland, The Origin and Evolution of the Christian Church (London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1948), pp. 72 ff.

³*Xpīstōs* is the verbal adjective used in the Septuagint to translate the Hebrew מָשִׁיחַ . The actual word "Messiah" does not occur as a title in the Old Testament but merely as the passive participle of the verb "to anoint."

⁴Cf. Acts 9:2; 19:9, 23; 24:14, 22.

been a major problem for even the closest disciples. They had been un-willing to listen to Jesus as He foretold His death (cf. Matt. 16:21-23), and the crucifixion overcast many hopes and threw the disciples into confusion and dismay: ". . . We had hoped that he was the one to redeem Israel."⁵ They had been prepared to hail Him as Son of God and God's Anointed,⁶ but they were not prepared to combine with this the role of the Suffering Servant (cf. Isaiah 52-53). To confess one as the Christ and God-sent King of man, who had lived in poverty as Jesus had done, and who, dishonoured by men, had died a criminal's death, meant the complete surrender of all pre-conceived ideas, and the acceptance of an entirely new conception of what was worthy of God and man.

The Crucifixion a Stumbling-Block

The attitude of the disciples, along with that of their fellow

⁵Luke 24:21.

⁶Wilhelm Wrede in his famous discussion, Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901), put forward the contention that the Messianic claim was never made by Jesus, but was read back into the history of the sub-apostolic age to explain why the Messiahship of Jesus was not recognized until after the resurrection. The evidence which led Wrede to speak of a Messianic Secret is clear enough, although the explanation which he gave of it does not appear to be probable (vide infra). Rudolf Bultmann, "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein Jesu und das Petrus-Bekenntnis," Z.N.T.W., XIX, No. 3/4 (1919-20), pp. 165-169, and in Theology of the New Testament, trans. by Kendrick Grobel (London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1952), I, pp. 26 ff., joins Wrede in questioning the Messianic consciousness of Jesus. However, Jesus' Messiahship was already more or less strongly present in the minds of the disciples even before His death, and this helps to explain the spontaneity of the conviction after the resurrection. Cf. William Manson, Jesus the Messiah (London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1943), esp. pp. 1-19. Cf. also T. W. Manson, "Realized Eschatology and the Messianic

countrymen is understandable in the light of the popular Messianic ideals of the day. The Jewish mind knew little, or nothing, of a suffering and dying Messiah. Joseph Klausner says:

In the whole Jewish Messianic literature of the Tannaitic period there is no trace of the "suffering Messiah." All the references to the suffering Messiah in Rabbinic literature that were so diligently collected by Dalman belong without exception to the post-Tannaitic period, when Christian influences cannot be wholly discounted.⁷

Some scholars, such as Joachim Jeremias,⁸ try to prove the existence of a Jewish doctrine of a suffering and dying Messiah on the ground of the rabbis' Messianic interpretation of Isaiah 53. But Professor William Manson has shown by comparing the text of Isaiah 53 with the corresponding section of the Targum that while the exaltation passages are ascribed to the Messiah, any trace of humiliation is referred to Israel or to the nations of the Gentiles.

The disfigurement, the oppression, the humiliation, and the penal suffering for guilt, of which the passage speaks are trans-

Secret, in Studies in the Gospels: Essays in the Memory of R. H. Lightfoot, ed. by D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), pp. 202-222.

⁷The Messianic Idea in Israel, 3rd ed., trans. by W. F. Stinespring, (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1956), p. 405. According to the author the "Tannaitic period" is the period beginning with Hillel and Shammai and ending with the final redaction of the Mishnah, thus from about 10 A. D. until 220 A. D. He refers to Gustaf Dalman's Der leidende und sterbende Messias der Synagoge im ersten nachchristlichen Jahrtausend (Berlin: 1888), pp. 35-84. See W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (London: S.P.C.K., 1948), pp. 276 ff., for theories of a pre-Christian Suffering Messiah. The only positive conclusion that he can draw is this: "the assumption is at least possible that the conception of a Suffering Messiah was not un-familiar to pre-Christian Judaism."

⁸ *Παῖς Θεοῦ* . " T.W.N.T., V, pp. 697 f.

ferred from the Servant-Messiah either to Israel (lii.14, liii.2,4, 10) or to the wicked nations or kingdoms (liii.3,7,8,9,11).⁹

Not only was the view of a suffering and dying Messiah quite alien to the normal Jewish mind, but for many it was offensive.¹⁰ The Jews had suffered much under foreign peoples: Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians (though this was a lenient rule), Egyptians, Syrians, and Romans. Some of their own leaders had added to their suffering. Thus they longed for a Messiah to deliver them and re-establish the Davidic kingdom. They had had more than enough of suffering and humiliation; now they yearned for vindication and reward. A suffering Messiah was at the time inconceivable and unwanted.

The Interpretative Principle of the Resurrection

And thus it is that in the opening chapters of Acts we see the

⁹Op. cit., p. 170. At the most there was a certain parallel in the belief that the Messiah would die at the end of the Messianic age and rise again with His saints (II Esdras 7:27 ff.). From this source His death was to follow in natural course after He had finished His work and ruled prosperously for a long age over the restored Israel. A violent death, consequent on defeat, was utterly foreign to the Messianic hope of the Apocalypses. S. Mowinkel, He That Cometh, trans. by G. W. Anderson (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1956), p. 329, says: "Somewhat later [later than the times of Jesus] we find the idea of a suffering Messiah in the sayings of individual rabbis, but in a different sense, and never as a doctrine which is universally accepted." In Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho, c. 150 A. D., we find an admission by the Jew, Trypho, that the Scriptures foretell a Messiah destined to suffer (Chaps. lxviii, lxxxix, xc), but this is probably a concession which some Jews at that time found themselves compelled to make under the stress of controversy with Christians. At any rate, the isolated testimony of Trypho cannot be used as a witness to first-century Judaism.

¹⁰Cf. Matt. 16:21 f.; Mark 8:31; 9:31; Luke 24:20 f.; Acts 17:3; I Cor. 1:23; Gal. 5:11.

Apostolic Church faced with the problem of the crucifixion. The one thing that enabled them to justify all that had happened, and that lifted their dejection into the light of a living hope, was the resurrection. Thus the verdict of man was reversed by the verdict of God, and the Galilean Prophet whose Messianic claims had been rejected by the rulers of the nations was by the supreme act of Almighty God vindicated as the Christ. Men had slain Jesus as a false Messiah, but God vindicated His claims by raising Him from the dead. It was not enough, however, to maintain that this death had been a terrible mistake. The grand episode in which the life of Jesus had culminated could be no mere accident: both His death and resurrection had been planned by God as foretold by the prophets.

Consequently the first major task of the apostolic preaching was to remove the "scandal of the cross." To the ordinary Jew the fact that Jesus had been crucified was a proof that He could not be the Christ; God had rejected His claim and thus He was a blasphemer. In support of this Deuteronomy 21:23 was quoted: ". . . for a hanged man is accursed by God." The thought expressed in this text played a significant rôle in the early controversy, and the phrase "Jesus is accursed" became the watchword of the unbelieving Jews.¹¹ Because the crucifixion was a stumbling block to the Jews this impression had to be dispelled and Jesus shown to be what He had claimed to be, and until this could be done all

¹¹Cf. I Cor. 12:3; Gal. 3:13.

preaching of the Christian message was futile. Hence, the defence of the Christ rather than the exposition of His teaching was the need of the hour, and thus we see that the kerygma of the primitive community concentrated on the Person of Christ.

THE TESTIMONY OF PETER AND THE EARLY CHURCH TO JESUS' MESSIAHSHIP

The first spokesman for the primitive church¹² was the Apostle Peter, and his speech on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:14 ff.) may be said to be the earliest Christian apologetics.¹³ It is significant that Peter, who had been the first to recognize Jesus as the Christ (Mark 8:29), who also had been the first official witness of the Risen Lord (I Cor. 15:4), was now again the first to rescue from the ship-

¹²It is noteworthy that Ernst Lohmeyer, Galiläa und Jerusalem (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936), followed by Frederick C. Grant, The Earliest Gospel (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1943), Chap. VI, have expressed the view that there is evidence, chiefly from Luke, that the concept of Messiah was more prominently emphasized in Jerusalem and Judea than it was in Galilee, where the term "Son of Man" was favoured. Cf., however, Harmen Holtrop, De Verschijningen Onzes Heeren te Jeruzalem en in Galilea (Amsterdam: S. J. P. Bakker, 1947), Section III, who does not accept Lohmeyer's thesis that Christianity came forward out of a two-fold source (i. e. Jerusalem and Galilee).

¹³The author is assuming the genuineness of Peter's sermon and that his speech is a true representation of the spirit of Jewish Christianity. The Apostle's speech does not claim to be a word-for-word quotation, but surely Luke must have known the substance of what had been said on the occasion, and thus he would not have been governed solely by his imagination and his own view of the meaning of the events. On the speeches in Acts see H. J. Cadbury in The Beginnings of Christianity, F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (eds.), Part I, The Acts of the Apostles (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1933), V, pp. 402-427; Floyd V. Filson, Jesus Christ The Risen Lord (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), pp. 37-39; and Martin Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of

wreck of his earlier Messianic hopes a belief in the Person and divine vocation of Jesus as the Christ. This experience seems in keeping with the biblical witness to the personality of Peter as we consistently see him, one quick to comprehend spiritual truths and just as quick in his expression of these truths.¹⁴ The Apostle's message here in Acts 2 contains little of reasoned doctrines because his primary interest was not in dogmatic questions of why, on what grounds, or with what aim Christ had had to suffer. Rather his main purpose was to prove simply that the sufferings of Christ were a divinely ordained necessity, founded in the will and predetermined counsel of God, and therefore not a thwarting of it, nor in contradiction with the revealed vocation of the Messiah. The supreme argument for the Messiah was the resurrection, for it effaced the impression left by a disgraceful death, proved that Jesus was no impostor, and vindicated all His claims. Indeed, the subject of this sermon at Pentecost can well be entitled: "Jesus the Nazarene, the enthroned Messiah."¹⁵

the Apostles (London: S.C.M. Press, Ltd., 1956), pp. 138-185.

¹⁴In his commentary on Jesus' remarks to Peter ("You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church"- Matt. 16:18), T. W. Manson states that this does not mean that the foundation of the church is Peter, but he goes on to say, "There is, however, a sense in which it might be said that the Church was built on Peter; and that depends on the fact that Peter is the first witness to the Resurrection. In this sense he is the first member of the Church, the first witness to the fact that Jesus has been made both Lord and Christ, and declared to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection of the dead." (From Book II "The Sayings of Jesus" in The Mission and Message of Jesus, H. D. A. Major, T. W. Manson, G. J. Wright (London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1940), p. 496).

¹⁵In commenting on this sermon, J. A. T. Robinson, "The Most

The Apostle's emphasis on the resurrection was not an after-thought nor an attempt to make the best of a tragedy; rather he sought to show that the resurrection was (like Christ's death) a part of God's eternal purpose. Peter shows that the resurrection of the Messiah had been foretold in the Scriptures. Like every Jew who had lived under the shadow of the synagogue, he was well acquainted with the sacred books, and from this treasure-house of memories he was able to cite Scripture in support of his faith in the Messiahship of Jesus. He quotes from Psalm 16 and 132 and claims that this resurrection refers not to David who had died and suffered corruption, but rather to Jesus. But Peter did not content himself with finding the resurrection in the Scriptures; he employed prophecy (Psalm 110) also to prove that the Messiah would ascend into the heavens and sit down at the right hand of God.¹⁶ This he claimed for Jesus, as was evidenced by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. The Apostle believed that the Holy Spirit had been given to Christ (Acts 2:33; 5:30-33), and that Christ in turn had sent the Spirit as a herald of the coming of the new age.¹⁷ Peter, it is true, does not

Primitive Christology of All?," op. cit., p. 185, says: "Acts ii comes to us as the most finished and polished specimen of the apostolic preaching, placed as it were in the shop window of the Jerusalem Church and of Luke's narrative."

¹⁶For the primitive use of Psalm 110 and Joel 2:28-32 (cited by Peter in Acts 2) as testimonia, see C. H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures (London: Nisbet & Co., Ltd., 1952), pp. 34 f. and 46 ff.

¹⁷Vide infra, Part IV, for the relation between the exalted Christ and the sending of the Spirit.

mention distinctly two ages, but the distinction is clearly implied by his reference to the fact that his generation was living in "the last days." This meant that the Pentecost events were the preliminary signs¹⁸ of the end when the reigning Messiah was to return to earth to complete His Messianic work. He thought of his times as an intermediate period, the transitory phase of history between the old order and the new.¹⁹ The Apostle closed his message with the declaration that the crucified, now risen Jesus, had been made both Lord and Christ (vs.36).²⁰ The lowly Nazarene had been elevated to new Messianic dignity in heaven.

In his sermons after Pentecost the Apostle continues to proclaim the resurrection and exaltation as we see in Acts 3:15;²¹ 4:10; 5:31;

¹⁸Only in the apocalypses (those of the Synoptics, the Johannine, and in the apocalyptic fragments of the letters of Paul) do we find mention of specific preliminary signs: cosmic catastrophes, wars, persecution, final call to repent. These appear at the end of the intermediate period. While Paul takes over this eschatological Messianic program from Judaism, he at the same time transcends it. The unhealthy tendencies toward ecstasy and idleness that early manifested themselves under the growing expectation of the Lord's speedy return in glory and of the catastrophic passing-away of the present order were rebuked by Paul, who emphasized the blessings and duties of the present life. Cf. Oscar Cullmann, Christ and Time, trans. by Floyd V. Filson (London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1951), p. 156.

¹⁹Ibid. Cf. G. R. Beasley Murray, Christ Is Alive! (London: Lutterworth Press, 1947), p. 172.

²⁰Judging from this verse Peter thought of the resurrection not only as vindicating Jesus' Messiahship but also as relating to His Lordship. Peter, however, dwells more on the Messiahship and it is not until later that the concept of Lordship is fully developed (vide infra section on Lordship). Certainly Christ was both Messiah and Lord, though the border-line which lies between no one can mark. It is fluid, the fluidity of deepening faith and vision.

²¹In relating Acts 2 and Acts 3 J. A. T. Robinson, "The Most

and 10:40-42. In these sermons we see Jesus represented as a man chosen and anointed by God, and now exalted at God's right hand.²² Perhaps nowhere else in the New Testament, with the significant exceptions of Philippians 2:6-11 and the Epistle to the Hebrews, can one find such an emphasis on the sharp contrast between what Jesus was and what He now has become, and on the transition from the low estate to the high. The exaltation described in Peter's sermons brings for Jesus not a change of nature (human to divine) but a change of status (Servant to Lord). These Petrine sermons preach uniquely an exaltation Christology.²³

We see that the primitive church, as represented by Peter, obtained a new insight into the hidden import of the Scriptures. This does not mean, however, that the Apostles originated the idea of the

Primitive Christology of All?," op. cit., p. 185, says that Acts 3 does not present the idea of the Messianic age as having already started, as found in Acts 2. He thinks that these two chapters represent not necessary "chronological stages, but conflicting estimates of the Christ-event, one of which was prepared to go further than the other." He suggests that Acts 3 might represent an older Christology which failed to establish itself in the church. Cf. Amos N. Wilder, "Variant Traditions of the Resurrection in Acts," J.B.L., LXII, Part IV (Dec., 1943), pp. 315 f.

²²Peter's presentation of Christ has close affinities with the early Christology of Mark, but, as noted by Jackson and Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, IV, p. 120, there seems to be a contrast to Luke's own view that Jesus was born as the Christ because He was conceived by the Holy Spirit. It is also somewhat different from the view of Matthew, who emphasizes the virgin birth, and the view of Paul and John who stress the pre-existence of Christ. It is, no doubt, the oldest Christology. Cf. C. H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments, pp. 37 ff.

²³Cf. E. Schweizer, "Discipleship and Belief in Jesus as Lord from Jesus to the Hellenistic Church," trans. by H. F. Peacock, N.T.S., II (1955-1956), p. 92, who says that Peter's emphasis is not so much the resurrection of Jesus from death as it is Jesus' exaltation.

Suffering Messiah Christology, but rather that it goes back to the intention of Jesus Himself.²⁴ They, of course, remembered Jesus' passion sayings,²⁵ and especially must they have recalled how the Risen Jesus, on the way to Emmaus, expounded to the two disciples the Scriptures concerning Himself--showing them that it was necessary that the Christ should suffer.²⁶ Their interpretation of the prophecies cannot be considered apart from their understanding of Jesus' attitude toward

²⁴See Vincent Taylor, The Life and Ministry of Jesus (London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1954), pp. 142 f., for a consideration of the Messianic suffering in the teaching of Jesus. Cf. also John W. Bowman, The Intention of Jesus (London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1945), esp. pp. 6 ff., 75 ff.; Joachim Jeremias, "Παλις Θεοῦ," op. cit., p. 711; Rudolf Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, trans. by Floyd V. Filson and Bertram Lee, Rev. Ed. (London: Lutterworth Press, 1943), pp. 249-61. Some, however, maintain that Jesus did not find the clue to His ministry in the fulfilment of the Suffering Servant prophecies. Cf. Kirsopp Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, I (1920), pp. 383 f.; F. Burkitt, Christian Beginnings (London: University of London Press, 1924), pp. 35-39.

²⁵Since W. Wrede, op. cit., explained all the passion passages as a dogmatic intrusion into the gospel tradition many have considered them un-authentic. While all scholars agree that Jesus realized the dangers surrounding Him, and recognized the hazard He took in going to Jerusalem, some (e.g. Dibelius, Bultmann) find it difficult to believe that He predicted the detailed events that were to occur. Thus they think of the passion announcements (Mk. 8:31; 9:31; 10:32-34) as "secondary," i. e., as either composed by Mark to suit his dramatic theological purpose, or at least modified to suit the passion narrative. However, as V. Taylor has pointed out, the passion announcements cannot justly be regarded as a "Markan construction"; they are too personal and suggest too the use of a story given in the tradition. See V. Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1952), pp. 374 f., The Formation of the Gospel Tradition (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1933); A. E. J. Rawlinson, St. Mark, 2nd Ed. (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1927) pp. 258-62; Joseph Klausner, Jesus of Nazareth, trans. by Herbert Danby (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1925), pp. 300 f.; T. W. Manson, op. cit., pp. 209-22, The Servant-Messiah (Cambridge: University Press, 1953), pp. 80 ff.

²⁶Luke 24:25 ff.

them. Thus in the light of the interpretation that the Risen One put upon the Messianic promises, the disciples looked back on prophecy in the light of its fulfilment.²⁷ They perceived that it anticipated a Messiah who would accomplish His purpose through suffering and death. Assuredly, the question whether Jesus was Messiah was not merely a question of exegesis; those who did not accept it from Jesus' own words would not find proof in the Scriptures.

But from its post-resurrection vantage point, the church could see more meaning in the Scriptures than the Old Testament actors and writers could see at their earlier point in history. As they looked back to the Old Testament they found there the picture of a Suffering Servant and they related this Servant with Jesus. In doing so many passages must have come to their minds, but above all the passage in Isaiah 52:13-53:12.²⁸ We may well suppose that the appeal to this prophetic passage, as having foretold the sufferings and resurrection of Christ, must have made on many a similar impression as that which it made on the Ethiopian treasurer to whom Philip explained it (cf. Acts 8:30).

The disciples knew that Jesus had suffered to serve God's cause

²⁷Cf. Luke 24:45; Acts 13:29; I Cor. 15:3.

²⁸Cf. J. Jeremias, "Christological Interpretations of the Deutero-Isaiah Servant of God in the New Testament," in The Servant of God by W. Zimmerli and J. Jeremias (London: S.C.M. Press, Ltd., 1957), pp. 88-104. Cf. also James Muilenburg's introduction to Isaiah 40-66 in "The Book of Isaiah," I.B., V (1956), esp. pp. 404-410. While Muilenburg's view is one of many views about the Suffering Servant it is perhaps the most probable.

and save them; He had fulfilled the deepest insight and promise of the Old Testament. Their faith was not in an artificial interpretation of one passage; rather it rested on a more meaningful understanding of what Jesus had claimed during His earthly ministry, and on a clearer insight into the depths of the Old Testament prophecies. They preached that He had died for the sake of His sinful contemporaries and in fulfilment of the Scriptures (cf. I Cor. 15:3). Jesus had brought to their minds the significance of suffering for the Messiah, and they now recognized that Jesus was Messiah after all, though in a new and higher sense--the sense of His own gospel of humility, penitence, forgiveness, patience, endurance. He was the Christian Messiah, not the popular Jewish; yet the two were related, in fact identical.²⁹

The disciples realized that the earthly Jesus had not been Messiah in the full sense, i. e. as a "King Messiah."³⁰ Jesus of Nazareth, the

²⁹Cf. Joseph Klausner, "The Jewish and the Christian Messiah," op. cit., pp. 519-531.

³⁰He is "King Messiah" (Luke 23:2). In Judaism the Messiah was thought of as a glorious future king of Israel, greater than the kings of the earth (cf. John 6:15; 12:13-15). He is the King who enters Jerusalem in the Lord's name (Luke 19:38). He occupies the throne of David, reigns over the house of Jacob forever; and there is no end to His kingdom (Luke 1:32,33). The Acts and the epistles seldom speak of Christ as King (cf. Acts 17:7; I Thim. 6:15) but rather as "Lord," as we shall see below. Whatever may have been the reason for this, it is quite clear that the reality of the Kingship is taken up in the witness concerning the victorious Lord. Thus in the epistles we read of Christ's "Kingdom" (cf. Eph. 5:5; Col. 1:13; II Tim. 4:1,18; II Peter 1:11). See Oscar Cullmann, "The Kingship of Christ and the Church in the New Testament," in The Early Church, A. J. B. Higgins (ed.) (London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1956), pp. 100-137.

teacher of a band of disciples, the homeless wanderer, the man of the people without power or riches, had been anything but a King. But in the light of the resurrection and His exaltation³¹ the church looked up and beheld its Christ. Even in His earthly ministry He had been Messiah, but now by the resurrection He had been openly manifested as such. His life on earth had been only preliminary to that on which He now entered and in which He revealed Himself in His true dignity as the Messiah. Yet His new life was in some way continuous with that which He had lived on earth, as T. W. Manson has pointed out:

The work taken up by the Risen Lord is the work of the earthly ministry strengthened, intensified, enlarged, no doubt, but still

³¹Jesus' resurrection is usually viewed as the commencement of His exaltation and session at the Father's right hand, and though not always distinguished, the resurrection seems the inevitable accompaniment of the exaltation and vice versa. In the Apostles' reply to the council in Acts 5:32 the exaltation is mentioned, though obviously the resurrection is involved in the meaning. (Hebrews concentrates on the exaltation rather than the resurrection.) The two terms in a sense overlap. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, p. 45, and John Knox, Christ The Lord (Chicago: Willett, Clark & Co., 1945), p. 87, think that originally the two concepts were one and that it was not until later (Knox suggests the end of the first century, or soon afterwards) that the two events were distinguished from each other. But however unsatisfactory the narratives of the exaltation or ascension may be from the historical point of view, theologically speaking the resurrection is to be separated in thought. A. M. Ramsey, The Resurrection of Christ, 2nd ed. (London: Centenary Press, 1946), p. 123, says: "Although the resurrection and the exaltation are hardly to be separated as historical events, they are to be distinguished as theological truths. It is one thing to assert that Jesus Christ was no longer held fast by death, but it was another thing to confess that He shares in the eternity, omnipresence, and omnipotence of God." Cf. A. M. Ramsey, "What Was the Ascension?" in Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, Bulletin II (Oxford: The Oxford Press Ltd., 1951), pp. 43-50; Hermann Sasse, "Jesus Christ, the Lord," Mysterium Christi, G. K. A. Bell and Adolf Deissmann, eds. (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1930), p. 105; Joseph Haroutunian, "The Doctrine of the Ascension," Interpretation, X, No. 3 (July, 1956), pp. 275-281.

in all essentials the same tasks, informed by the same spirit and directed to the same ends. The Risen Christ still 'had compassion on the multitudes,' is still 'the friend of publicans and sinners,' still 'comes to give service rather than receive it,' still 'seeks and saves the lost.'³²

Thus the belief in the resurrection did not over-shadow the disciples' interest in what had gone before, but served to quicken the perception of what Jesus' life had meant.³³

The early church, as represented by Peter, thought of Jesus' resurrection as the revivification of the same body of flesh which was laid in the grave. In speaking of Jesus' resurrection Peter quotes Psalm 16:10 and says: "For thou wilt not abandon my soul to Hades, nor let thy Holy One see corruption."³⁴ The Apostle says that if Christ did descend to Hades He was not given over to its power (Acts 2:31). He reasons that it was not possible for Christ to be held by death and Hades because God loosed the pangs of death (vs. 24) so that His flesh did not see corruption (vs. 31). Peter's emphasis seems to be that the same body which was laid in the grave was that which rose again. For this reason, as in Luke 24:39-43, such emphasis is laid upon the eating and drinking of the Risen One (Acts 10:41); hence also the reason for Luke's mention of the forty days when Christ was in fellowship with His

³²The Servant-Messiah, pp. 95 f.

³³Cf. Ernest F. Scott, The Purpose of the Gospels (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949), p. 29.

³⁴Acts 2:27.

disciples (Acts 1:3). Jesus, in short, actually returned again to earth; hence the necessity at the end of the forty days of yet another miracle--that of the ascension (1:9). Like Moses or Elijah, Jesus was carried up by a cloud, since He still walked on earth and still belonged to earth. This view of the resurrection says nothing about the necessary change whereby the fleshly body rose from the grave and was transformed into the glorious heavenly body which later appeared to Saul of Tarsus in such kingly splendour. We have here in Acts the expression of the resurrection in its earliest form.

According to Acts, Peter was the first of the Apostles to preach the Messiahship of the Risen Jesus, but this conviction extended a kindling and inspiring influence to the other disciples. Thus the Hellenist Stephen, no doubt, entered into this same conviction, and it was he who seems to have been the first of the disciples to draw far-reaching inferences from Jesus' Messiahship so that he was brought before the council to answer charges (Acts 6:8 ff.). Then in Acts 8:5 we see that Philip the Evangelist preached in the city of Samaria of "the Christ."

The endeavour of the early disciples to prove to their fellow-Jews that the Risen Jesus was their God-appointed Deliverer was a tremendous undertaking. In the flow of their new-found confidence they hopefully assumed a readiness on the part of their kinsmen to credit their testimony regarding the appearances of Jesus and to accept their interpretation of His Person. Though they must have been encouraged by the

decisions of the Pentecost converts and that of later individuals,³⁵ they soon realized that their desire for Israel's recognition and acceptance of the Messiah was nearly a hopeless one. They never gave up hope however, but continued all the more to cite an increasing array of scriptural passages in support of their new faith, and related the story of Jesus' earthly career in a more effective manner.

THE TESTIMONY OF PAUL TO JESUS' MESSIAHSHIP

Saul, who had been unspeakably shocked by the contention of the Nazarenes that the Messiah was to be identified with the crucified Jesus, accepted the primitive church's characterization of Jesus as Messiah only after struggle. His difficulty would arise because of the difference between the Jesus whom the disciples proclaimed as Messiah and the Messiah of his inherited Jewish hopes. For though of extra-Palestinian Judaism, Paul was Hebrew of the Hebrews. He could not find place for the Jesus of history alongside his Messianic conceptions, and it must have seemed sacrilegious that anyone should say that one crucified by the Romans was Messiah because the Law had said ". . . a hanged man is accursed by God."³⁶ He felt that the disciples' claim was an insult to

³⁵Kaufmann Kohler, The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church (New York: Macmillan Co., 1929), p. 238, suggests that many Essenes, seeing their great hope fulfilled in Jesus, may have joined the church, not as a class but as individuals.

³⁶Cf. I Cor. 12:3; Gal. 3:13.

God and a subversion of the Law, and thus he had to set his face against the expansion of the sect, even if he had to do it by using force. But when Paul encountered the Risen Jesus he saw the realization of his people's dreams of the promised Messiah. In the middle of his activity motivated by his former Messianic ideas he suddenly felt compelled to stop. His conviction was abruptly reversed, and he knew all at once that the disciples were right.

In the very moment of his conversion it was a clear, formulable thought that stamped the new impress upon his life. The single sentence, 'Jesus is Messiah,' with its immediate implications-- this was all; but this is the germ of a dogma, and Paul's 'theology' is only the evolution of the germ.³⁷

It is significant that the Messiahship of Jesus was the theme of the first Christian sermons Paul preached: "... Saul increased all the more in strength, and confounded the Jews who lived in Damascus by proving that Jesus was the Christ."³⁸ The Messianic claim for Jesus-- the very thing that caused Paul to persecute the primitive community so intensely--was now his main theme. As is often the case, a convert to a new cause, of which he had previously been a bitter opponent, defends most vigorously the feature which had formerly been most hated. And if this is a regular psychological principle, we may infer that Paul's

³⁷ W. Wrede, Paul, trans. by Edward Lummis (London: Philip Green, 1907), p. 76.

³⁸ Acts 9:22. In 9:20 Paul declared: "He [Jesus] is the Son of God." As we shall see below, there is Messianic significance in the title "Son of God." Cf. Acts 17:3; 18:5,28; 26:23.

principal objection to the preaching of men like Stephen had been what then seemed to the persecutor an entirely unwarranted claim made for the crucified Jesus.³⁹ The Apostle's conviction that Jesus was the Christ was now so positive and influential that the Jews plotted to kill him.

The Apostle's Development

Though Paul entered into the belief of the primitive community that Jesus was the Christ, for him Jesus was not simply a Jewish Messiah, but much more--a world Redeemer. Professor J. S. Stewart says:

All the local, national, and material ideas which Jewish Messianism had developed so strongly were completely transcended. Blessed in his own soul with so wonderful a redemption, Paul knew instinctively that no racial limits and no traditional categories could hold the Redeemer he had now discovered: His meaning, His message, and His mission were universal. Not a new Israel, but a new humanity, was to be His creation.⁴⁰

For him, therefore, the maintenance of the Messianic claim for Jesus meant a new attitude toward life. The Apostle's penetration into the heart of Jesus' Messiahship was deeper and his horizon broader; so it devolved upon him to bring into the light of day the universalism implicit in Christianity from the very beginning.

Jesus' exaltation at God's right hand meant that He was to put down the hostile principalities and powers and destroy them (I Cor. 15: 24 ff.), until at last all opposition against the will of God would be

³⁹ Shirley Jackson Case, Jesus Through the Centuries (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932), pp. 88 f.

⁴⁰ A Man In Christ, p. 299. Cf. p. 300 where Professor Stewart shows that Paul was not limited in his thinking to his inherited pre-Christian Messianic dogma.

overcome and God be all in all, His will supreme everywhere. The exaltation of Jesus, the commencement of the Messiah's heavenly reign, meant accordingly the victorious beginning, the assurance of the final and complete rule of God. For Paul the new era had already begun, even though its final consummation still lay in the future. Thus the Apostle's Messianic hope marked a great step in advance of Judaism generally.

THE MESSIANIC SECRET AND THE RESURRECTION

While it is outside the bounds of this thesis to deal exhaustively with the Messianic consciousness of Jesus or the much-discussed problem of the "Messianic secret," it is necessary and appropriate that we consider views of Jesus' Messiahship which are related to the resurrection. In his famous discussion, Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien, Wilhelm Wrede contends that the Messianic claim was never made by Jesus, but was read back into the history of the sub-apostolic age to explain why the Messiahship of Jesus was not recognized until after the resurrection. According to Wrede, the idea that Jesus was, or might be, the Messiah had never occurred to any one before the resurrection. It was wholly a product of subsequent Christian theology, but once it had arisen, then inevitably the attempt was made to re-interpret the life of Jesus as having been that of the Messiah--a revelation and yet a concealment of the Messiah as He now appeared in the light of Christian faith.

Certainly Jesus had insisted upon keeping His Messiahship a

secret until He "should have risen from the dead" (Mark 9:9), but Wrede's explanation of the secrecy is not satisfying. Many scholars have had little difficulty in rejecting the theory in this extreme form, pointing to the confession of Peter, the transfiguration, the entry into Jerusalem, the reply of Jesus to Caiaphas, the title on the cross, and the improbability that the first Christians would have held Jesus to be the Messiah unless He had been recognized as such before the resurrection.⁴¹ These are strong reasons for believing that Jesus did claim to be the Christ before the resurrection.⁴²

It seems evident that the reason why Jesus insisted that His disciples should not speak of His Messiahship was that He realized that

⁴¹See Adolph Jülicher, Neue Linien in der Kritik der evangelischen Überlieferung (Giessen: Alfred Topelmann, 1906), pp. 26 ff.; William Sanday, The Life of Christ in Recent Research (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907), pp. 74 ff.; A. S. Peake, "The Messiah and the Son of Man," in The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, VIII, No. 1 (Jan., 1924), pp. 52-81; A. E. J. Rawlinson, op. cit., pp. 258-262; R. H. Lightfoot, History and Interpretation in the Gospels (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935), pp. 16-22; John W. Bowman, op. cit., pp. 137-164; Vincent Taylor, "Unsolved New Testament Problems," in E.T., LIX, No. 6 (March, 1948), pp. 146-151, and in The Gospel According to St. Mark, pp. 122-124; Albert Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, 3rd ed. (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1954), pp. 336-348; T. W. Manson, "Realized Eschatology and the Messianic Secret," op. cit., pp. 202-222; J. W. Leitch, "The Injunctions of Silence in Mark's Gospel," E.T., LXVI, No. 6 (March, 1955), p. 178.

⁴²Cf. T. A. Burkill, "Concerning St. Mark's Conception of Secrecy," The Hibbert Journal, LV (Jan., 1957), pp. 154 f., who in his criticism of Vincent Taylor, thinks that the above arguments are weak. However, see V. Taylor's "Messianic Secret in Mark: Rejoinder to Dr. T. A. Burkill," The Hibbert Journal, LV (April, 1957), pp. 241-248.

He could not publicly proclaim Himself as the Messiah without stirring into flame passions of a kind which would have rendered the people deaf to His unique message.⁴³ Jesus was reticent about proclaiming His Messiahship because He had deliberately rejected so much that the concept connoted in the minds of His contemporaries. Jesus did not deny that He was the Messiah but He could not freely claim a title which, in terms of current expectation, ran counter to His conception of His mission. The public announcement of His Messiahship, without a re-interpretation, would only lead to misunderstanding. Even Peter had thought in terms of normal Jewish ideas, which although they must have varied considerably, involved some notion of a material kingdom. Jesus, however, held a view of the Messiah which was unique.⁴⁴ He had incorporated in His own conception much that was said of the Suffering Servant in the prophecy of Isaiah. Consequently He had still to teach His disciples that for Him to be the Messiah involved the necessity of submitting Himself to suffering and death. This teaching the disciples did not succeed in assimilating until the tragedy of the Passion had been succeeded by the triumph of the resurrection. Finally, Jesus thought of His Messiahship not primarily as a matter of status, but of action.

⁴³ Thus it is significant that in Nazareth (Luke 4:24) He is represented as assuming the role of a prophet.

⁴⁴ Cf. Anders Nygren, "The Transformation of the Messianic Concept," in Christ and His Church, trans. by Alan Carlsten (London: S.P.C.K., 1957), pp. 52 ff.

Had His Messiahship been a question of status it could have been claimed in words apart from deeds. But Jesus taught that a man is to be estimated not by words but by his life. This principle He applied to Himself, setting forth His Messiahship in His ministry as a whole⁴⁵ rather than by any special teaching about it. The claim He made required more than a simple affirmation of Messiahship in terms recognizable to the popular mind, and the very nature of Jesus' claim would not allow it to be communicated directly, for every man must apprehend it for himself. Thus we see that the Messiahship which Jesus represented entailed far more than the Jewish religion had ever dreamed, or had hoped.

Certainly the disciples recognized Jesus as Messiah during His ministry, but, as seen above, they did not think of the earthly Jesus as Messiah in the full sense, i. e. as a reigning Messiah. Various adjectives (Messias designatus,⁴⁶ passurus,⁴⁷ absconditus,⁴⁸ and futurus⁴⁹)

⁴⁵In His works of healing and exorcism, in His victory over Satanic powers, in suffering, dying, and rising again, and as coming in triumph with the clouds of heaven.

⁴⁶Alfred Loisy, The Gospel and the Church, trans. by Christopher Home (London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1908), p. 103; Michaelis, Reich Gottes und Geist Gottes, as cited by V. Taylor, "Unsolved New Testament Problems," op. cit., p. 151.

⁴⁷C. K. Barrett, The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition (London: S.P.C.K., 1947), p. 119.

⁴⁸Ibid.

⁴⁹Albert Schweitzer, The Mystery of the Kingdom of God, trans. by Walter Lowrie (London: A. & C. Black, 1925), Chap. VIII. Cf. Martin Dibelius, Gospel Criticism and Christology (London: Ivor Nicholson &

have been used to describe Jesus' pre-resurrection Messiahship, but none of them is entirely satisfactory. Whatever adjective one chooses to use, it is imperative that he takes into account the fact that while the disciples thought of Jesus in one sense as already Messiah, He was in another sense presently to become the Messiah in power (cf. Rom. 1: 4). To them Jesus' disclosure of His Messiahship had reference to the time of the dawning of the Kingdom, and when the Kingdom was realized then would His Messiahship be revealed in its glory.

When Jesus' Messiahship was revealed to the disciples it hardly had the meaning for them that it has for us, or even the meaning that it soon was to have for them after the resurrection; rather for them it meant that Jesus was the One who was soon to inaugurate the Messianic reign.⁵⁰ However, we must be careful to distinguish their understanding of the Messiahship and that of Jesus. We cannot justly say that Jesus claimed Messianic dignity only for the future, as Messias designatus, or that He refrained from asserting it as an actual present fact. To do this does not satisfy the recorded data. Jesus not only looked forward to fulfilling the office of Messiahship when the heavenly Kingdom should be ushered in, but He believed that He was already serving the

Watson, 1935), p. 25. Dibelius agrees with Schweitzer in saying that the early disciples thought of Jesus as the "Messiah designate," whose reign was to come. However, he goes on (p. 47) to say that the creators of the Gospel tradition thought of Jesus' Messiahship as already realized. "As Messiah Jesus went to his death, his messiahship was confirmed by the fact that God did not forsake him in his death, and he will come again to inaugurate his reign. What we must therefore realize is this: the life of Jesus runs its course before Easter, whereas the tradition of his life was formed after Easter and conditioned by the events of Easter."

⁵⁰Cf. A. Schweitzer, The Mystery of the Kingdom of God, p. 187.

rôle of Messiah during His earthly life. But while this is true, it seems clear that the disciples' understanding was that their Messiah's most characteristic and decisive work awaited the future when He would reign in power and glory.

When Peter had professed, "You are the Christ," he believed that Jesus was truly the Messiah, but he looked forward to seeing the Messiah acting in power. This same future thought is seen in Cleopas' statement to the Risen Jesus: ". . . we had hoped that he was the one to redeem Israel."⁵¹ Hence this futuristic idea must be taken into account as we consider the early disciples' understanding of Jesus' Messiahship. If the disciples had believed that Jesus possessed full Messianic dignity during His earthly ministry it is hardly conceivable that they would have proclaimed that He had entered upon this Messianic existence through the resurrection.

This interpretation seems to be in keeping with Peter's statement in Acts 2:36: "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly that God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified." Thus in virtue of the resurrection does He attain to the fullness of the Messianic dignity. Johannes Weiss, who has ^{been} foremost in claiming the "adoptionist" implication of the Christology of the sermons in Acts, contrasts this idea with the later Christologies to show the primitive character of the Petrine sermon. He lays great emphasis on

⁵¹Luke 24:21.

this verse and thinks of it as the principal proof text for the earliest Christology.⁵² While Weiss thinks of this verse as an expression of adoptionist Christology we must not overlook the fact that for the disciples His becoming the Messiah had its cause in what He had been from the very beginning. He could become the Messiah in glory only because He had been the Messiah even while in His humiliation. Peter's emphasis is on what Jesus has become by means of His resurrection and exaltation, but the potentiality of this becoming lies in what He was already. While Acts 2:36 cannot be considered as a well defined systematic statement of adoptionism, it is a picture of the primitive church's grasping for new meaning in the resurrection event. Thus in the words of Alfred Loisy, "His resurrection was in a sense His coronation; the coronation did not make Him a king but He was crowned because He was a King."⁵³

THE MESSIAHSHIP AND THE BELIEF IN THE RESURRECTION

On the other extreme from the position of Wrede is the view that the Messianic faith of the disciples was so strong that their belief in

⁵²The History of Primitive Christianity, I, pp. 32 f., 113 f., and "Acts of the Apostles," in Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, James Hastings, ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906), p. 27. So also John Knox, Christ The Lord, pp. 85 f. Cf. Reginald H. Fuller, The Mission and Achievement of Jesus (London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1954), p. 111.

⁵³Loc. cit.

Jesus as the Messiah led them to believe in Jesus' resurrection.

H. D. A. Major has said: "It was their conviction that He was the Messiah which compelled them to believe in His Resurrection."⁵⁴ Major believes that as soon as the disciples recovered from the terror and horror of Jesus' crucifixion they took comfort in the conviction that "... thou wilt not abandon my soul to Hades, nor let thy Holy One see corruption."⁵⁵

They were convinced that so vital, so transcendent, so Divine a personality could not be conquered by death or rejected by God: this personality came from God and must go to God. This explanation . . . demands no resurrection act of an objective kind, whether historical or psychical, to prove it. It has its foundation in the impression which the personality of Jesus made upon His disciples and the power and permanence of that impression constituted the impulse which created the Christian Church. It was this which gave the Apostles the Pentecostal experience of being the recipients of the Spirit of Jesus and enabled them to transmit that Spirit to later ages and to many lands.⁵⁶

⁵⁴H. D. A. Major, T. W. Manson, and C. J. Wright, The Mission and Message of Jesus (London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, Ltd., 1937), p. 217.

⁵⁵Psalm 16:10 as quoted by Peter in Acts 2:27.

⁵⁶H. D. A. Major, loc. cit. Several interpreters agree with Major as to the significance of the personality of Jesus in connection with His resurrection. Cf. Arnold Meyer, Die moderne Forschung über Geschichte des Urchristentums (Leipzig: J.C.B. Mohr, 1898), pp. 65, 69; Otto Pfleiderer, Christian Origins, trans. by Daniel A. Huebsch (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1905), p. 138; S. J. Case, The Historicity of Jesus (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1912), pp. 278 ff.; E. W. Barnes, The Rise of Christianity (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1947), pp. 168 ff.; J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, I, pp. 19 f., 30 ff., 43; R. Bultmann, "The Study of the Synoptic Gospels," in Form Criticism, pp. 71 f. M. Goguel has pointed out both the profound discouragement of the disciples as well as the tremendous impact of the personality of Jesus on His disciples, but he sides with the view that the minds of the disciples were predisposed to the idea of the resurrection. Confidence in the continued heavenly life of Jesus existed before His resurrection

There is little question as to the tremendous effect of the personality of Jesus upon the disciples, but there is no evidence that their belief in Jesus' Messiahship was so developed as to bring about this attitude in the minds of the disciples. Indeed, they had confessed Him as Messiah and had hoped that He would redeem Israel, but the crucifixion was a far greater blow to their Messianic faith than Dr. Major and others would lead us to believe. It was not simply a matter of recovering from the initial horror of the crucifixion after a few days of quiet and meditation during which they could review in their minds what the Scriptures had said about the death of the Messiah. The scandalon of the cross was real and their hope of Jesus being the Christ had been severely shaken. Nothing apart from the resurrection could have re-awakened in them their faith in Jesus as Messiah. Thus the Apostles

appearances and explains them. Thus faith in the heavenly life of Christ was not something new caused by the appearances. See Goguel's works, The Birth of Christianity, pp. 74 f., Jesus the Nazarene, pp. 226, 228 ff., La Foi a la Résurrection de Jésus dans le Christianisme Primitif, pp. 394, 419. Karl Kautsky, Foundations of Christianity, trans. from 13th German ed. [no translator] (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1925), p. 374, makes an appropriate comment in this connection: "If it was only the personal impression made by Jesus that produced the faith in his resurrection and his divine mission, this faith would necessarily become weaker as personal recollection of him died away, and the number of people who had been in personal contact with him decreased."

After making this statement Kautsky goes on to give his explanation of what preserved the Messianic activity of Jesus--an explanation which, in our opinion, is worse than the one he rightfully condemned. He says that it was not Jesus' personality but the organization which held the disciples together and attracted increasing numbers of new adherents. "It was not the faith in the resurrection of the Crucified which created the Christian congregation and gave it its strength, but, on the contrary, it was the vigor and strength of the congregation that created the belief in the continued life of the Messiah" (p. 378, cf. pp. 374 ff.).

began with the resurrection and saw in it the vindication of their Messianic hope--not with a Messianic faith so strong that it compelled them to believe in some type of a resurrection.⁵⁷

CONCLUSION

The Person of Jesus was greater than the concept of Messiahship and a coming Kingdom, and it soon burst through the thought of the early faith. The Hebrew term for Messiah (מָשִׁיחַ) was a technical Jewish expression consecrated by long usage in the history of the past and therefore perfectly familiar to Jewish minds. For the Jewish Christians the title bore more on the future than the present, and carried men's minds into the world of eschatology. But when Christianity began to spread beyond the borders of Judaism and enter into the Greek world, the Greek word for Messiah (χριστός) was almost unintelligi-

⁵⁷On this point cf. G. S. Duncan, "The Resurrection Faith," E.T., XXXVII, No. 7 (April, 1926), pp. 330 f.; M. F. Egan, "Faith and the Resurrection," The Month, CLXIX, No. 874 (April, 1937), p. 302; Neville S. Talbot, The Mind of the Disciples (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1914), pp. 107 f.; Joseph Haroutunian, "Sin and Salvation," Religion In Life, XXI, No. 2 (Spring, 1952), pp. 200 ff.; Woodrow A. Geier, "God Revealed," Religion In Life, XXII, No. 2 (Spring, 1953), p. 214; C. H. Dodd, "The Kingdom of God and the Present Situation," The Christian Newsletter, Supplement No. 31 (May 29, 1940); S. J. Case, The Evolution of Early Christianity (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1914), pp. 332, 334; Rengstorff, Die Auferstehung Jesu, p. 36; J. Mackinnon, The Gospel in the Early Church (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1933), pp. 6 ff.; T. J. Barling, "Physical Resurrection," in Dare We Believe (Birmingham: The Christadelphians, 1951?), pp. 1-16; J. N. Sanders, The Foundations of the Christian Faith (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1950), pp. 107-110.

ble,⁵⁸ and certainly conveyed no clear meaning to the minds of the new converts. Emphasis was now not only on the future but the present age as well. The resurrection had sufficiently demonstrated Jesus as the Messiah and this concept of Messiahship became, even before the New Testament was completed,⁵⁹ so much a part of the church's estimate of Jesus that the title "Christ" became virtually the second half of a proper name--Jesus Christ. It was necessary therefore to translate *Χριστός* into an equivalent term which would be intelligible to the thought of all Christians. As we shall see, other titles helped to express the resurrection faith of the church even more clearly and comprehensively.

⁵⁸Proof that it was well-nigh unintelligible to Hellenists is seen in their corruption of it into *Χρηστός*. Cf. e. g. Suetonius, The Deified Claudius, 25. 4. "Since the Jews constantly made disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus, he expelled them from Rome." Cf. also Tertullian, Apology 3. 5. "'Christian,' so far as translation goes, is derived from 'anointing.' Yes, and when it is mispronounced by you 'Crestian' (for you have not even certain knowledge of the mere name) it is framed from 'sweetness' or 'kindness.'" See William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, "*Χριστός*," in A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Cambridge: University Press, 1957), p. 895.

⁵⁹For Paul the formula "Jesus is the Christ" is a presupposition. In the majority of cases he uses "Christ" as a personal name. No stress can be laid on the presence or the absence of the article before *Χριστός*, as a comparison of I Cor. 1:13, 17 and 23 shows. Luke also uses *Χριστός* as a proper name. H. J. Cadbury, op. cit., I, p. 367, says: "It is only either when, as it were, he stops to think, or when he is reproducing his sources, that he used the word as a title." The use of Christ as a name probably arose before the middle of the first century since it is used as such in some of Paul's early epistles.

II: LORD

From the moment the Apostles were convinced of the resurrection of Christ as a fact they found it necessary to re-evaluate their estimate of Jesus and His earthly ministry. Instead of despair there was now hope, and because God had raised His crucified Son, the Cross, once a stumbling-block, was now, as St. Paul declares it, the power and wisdom of God. The resurrection called for a fuller understanding of the Person of Christ because the Suffering Servant was now exalted and given a name above every name. No longer was it adequate to think of Him only as "the Christ," still less as "the Teacher," or "the Prophet," and His own chosen name "the Son of Man," was too mysterious to become a generally used title. But the one title that came spontaneously to the minds of the disciples as they encountered this Risen One who had conquered death and was now living was "LORD."¹

THE USE OF THE TITLE "LORD": ITS PRE- AND POST-RESURRECTION SIGNIFICANCE

The apostles had addressed their master as "Lord" during His lifetime, using the term as a title of respect in a sense not very different

¹Cf. V. Taylor's works, The Names of Jesus, p. 49, The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1958), pp. 143 ff. In the latter reference Taylor gives a helpful table of the use of the title "Lord" in the whole of the New Testament. He states that it is used 345 times in a post-resurrection sense. Paul himself uses it 138 times, in addition to the 84 occasions when it is employed in combination with other names.

from that in which any rabbi might be addressed by his pupils, especially when used in the vocative. The word *Kúpie* may be used as a form of address not only to Christ or to God, but by a slave in addressing his master (Matt. 13:27; 25:11, 20, 22, 24; Luke 13:8; 14:22; 19:16 ff.), by a son to his father (Matt. 21:30), or, more generally, in addressing anyone who is superior in rank (Matt. 27:63), or to whom it is intended to show respect (John 11:21; 20:15; Acts 16:30).²

Kurios is not a Christological title in either the "Q" source or Mark, except possibly the one instance in Mark 11:3 (and parallels, Matt. 21:3; Luke 19:31) in reference to Jesus' message to His disciples about the colt: "The Lord has need of it . . ." This phrase is usually interpreted to refer to Jesus, but as far as the actual meaning is concerned it need not mean more than "the Master has need of it," save doubtless in the mind of the evangelist and the post-resurrection readers.³ This is the only occasion in Mark where there is any probability of Jesus'

²In one sense or another the title Kurios is applied to Christ throughout the New Testament. It occurs in all the documents with the exceptions of Titus and the Epistles of John. Its absence in Titus seems to be due to the pointed preference for *τῷ κυρίῳ* as a title for Christ (1:4; 2:13; 3:6).

³Vincent Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1952), p. 455, suggests that *κύριος αὐτοῦ* may mean the "owner" of the colt, thus assuming that the owner was not at home but with Jesus. This suggestion is not likely because *αὐτοῦ* surely goes with *Χρῆται*, not with *ὁ κύριος*. Certainly in Luke 19:33 it is the owners (*οἱ κύριοι αὐτοῦ*) who are told that the Lord has need of the colt. G. V. Jones, Christology and Myth in the New Testament (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1956), p. 116, states that this "may indicate an embellishment on the part of Luke (the only Synoptist to apply the term Kurios to Jesus in the sense which we have in mind) or that the Markan tradition was uncertain as to how Kurios should be understood."

using the term of Himself, and the manner in which the word is used makes it doubtful if He did so here.⁴ In Mark 2:28 ("... the Son of Man is lord even of the sabbath.") the phrase *KÚPIOS TOÛ ΣΑΒΒΑΤΟΥ* describes the One who exercises authority over the use of the Sabbath and is not used as a title. In Mark 5:19, where the Gadarene demoniac is told to go and tell his friends how much the "Lord" has done for him, the reference is probably to Yahweh rather than Jesus.⁵

In Matthew and Luke there are some passages in which the term might be interpreted as either Master or Lord (Matt. 14:28; 20:31; Luke 6:46), but Luke alone of the Synoptists unambiguously and extensively uses Kurios as a Christological title.⁶ It is significant that Luke never uses the title in an actual saying, except in 24:34, which is in connection with the resurrection message: "The Lord has risen indeed." In all the other instances it appears in the phrase "and the Lord said" or its equivalent.

Vincent Taylor, in his study of The Names of Jesus, states that the Fourth Gospel confirms the view that Kurios is a post-resurrection title.⁷ He believes there is good reason to think that the instances of John 4:1; 6:23; 11:2, are the result of a copyist's gloss. Other pre-resurrection

⁴G. V. Jones, Ibid.

⁵Compare *ὁ Θεός* in the parallel, Luke 8:39.

⁶Luke 7:13,19; 10:1,39,41; 11:39; 12:42; 13:15; 17:5,6; 18:6; 19:8; 22:61; 24:34. In some MSS the title also appears in 22:31 and 24:3, in addition to 19:31,34 (which are parallel to Mark 11:3). Luke curiously retains the Markan title in Mark 9:5, whereas Matthew alters it.

⁷p. 43.

occurrences (for example, 13:36 f.) he would explain as used in the vocative as a "titular nominative." G. H. C. Macgregor, holding a similar view, explains the pre-resurrection usage as the possible result of a "... combination of the original words of the Evangelist and the Redactor's editing."⁸ Whether this is the case or not, one cannot help but notice John's frequent post-resurrection uses of the word (20:2, 13, 18, 20, 25, 28; 21:7, 12) and feel that he felt more at liberty to use it there than in connection with Jesus' earlier ministry.⁹

In these pre-resurrection instances when the term is used there is no reason to believe that any confession of the divinity of Jesus was implied.¹⁰ At the time when the Gospels were written the primitive community was no doubt speaking of Jesus as Lord, but the Evangelists had sufficient respect for history to avoid reading this concept of Lordship back into the earlier period. Though Luke uses the title as his narrative term he is careful not to read it back into the usual conversation of men prior to the resurrection. In speaking of the significance of

⁸The Gospel of John (The Moffatt New Testament Commentary), London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1928, pp. 92 f. In John 13:13,14, Jesus says to the disciples: "You call me Teacher and Lord; and you are right, for so I am." G. V. Jones, op. cit., p. 117, states that not only is respect implied, but "reverence and obedience in the presence of numinous holiness."

⁹Taylor, The Names of Jesus, p. 43.

¹⁰See Bertram Lee Woolf, The Authority of Jesus and Its Foundation (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1929), pp. 160 f., for a consideration of scripture passages which show that Jesus was hardly regarded in any sense as the object of religious worship. Cf. also John A. T. Robinson, "The Most Primitive Christology of All?," J.T.S., New Series, Vol. VII, Pt. 2 (Oct., 1956), pp. 180 f., who (in agreement with John Knox) states that the application of both "Christ" and "Lord" were "pushed back" prior to the resurrection.

Kurios as a title, Alfred Loisy says:

In its religious and ritual sense the use of the title was evidently applied to Jesus only as risen from the dead: but it was given him immediately when the belief arose that, after dying on earth as Jesus, he had risen to heaven as the Christ. The application of the term to Jesus was unpremeditated and entirely natural but it was big with consequences as no other title could have been.¹¹

The title as a polite form of address is no longer sufficient for the apostolic usage and the word becomes filled with a deeper meaning, signifying divine power and spiritual supremacy. At His resurrection Lordship is put on the shoulders of Jesus, and as Dr. Walter Künneth has stated, Christ is now given glory that He neither possessed in His pre-existent state nor His historical life.¹² By the power of His resurrection Christ entered upon a new sovereignty, pre-eminent in everything, and as exalted Lord, His authority in the church is supreme.

In the light of the resurrection the disciples re-appraised the life of Him who had lived among them as Son and Servant, and they saw that through His life of humility and self-sacrifice there had been manifested from the very beginning a sovereignty before which all earthly

¹¹The Birth of the Christian Religion, trans. by L. P. Jacks (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1948), p. 222. Cf. Elias Andrews, The Meaning of Christ For Paul (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949), pp. 136 f.; Oscar Cullmann, Baptism in the New Testament (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 1), trans. by J. K. S. Reid (London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1950), p. 17.

¹²Theologie der Auferstehung, 2 auflage (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1934), pp. 114 f. Künneth states: "Von höchster Wichtigkeit ist die Erkenntnis, dass in der Auferstehung Jesus etwas von Gott empfängt, was er noch nicht besitzt, nämlich das 'Herrsein'." Cf. A. E. Garvie, "The Resurrection and Pentecost," London Quarterly & Holborn Review, CLXVI (July, 1941), pp. 301, 304 f.; John Knox, The Early Church and the Coming Great Church (London: Epworth Press, 1957), pp. 71 f.

power and authority fell into a secondary place. Jesus had asserted His authority in the manner of His teaching, in rebuking the forces of nature, in casting out demons, forgiving sin, and restoring health and life. Because God had raised His Son from the dead, the disciples, who had lived with Jesus day by day and had witnessed these expressions of divine authority, now came to invest His power with even deeper esteem, and saw in it (as Jesus Himself had seen) a manifestation on earth of the authority of God Himself. Though Jesus' ministry was in keeping with what the prophets had foretold of God's Servant so that He humbled Himself and suffered meekly, He was ever aware that He had been "anointed" by God and He did not hesitate to speak and act in accordance with this commission when the occasion arose.¹³ Christ's words after the resurrection reveal this awareness: "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me" (Matt. 28:18).

Testimony of Thomas and Peter

Perhaps the first and loftiest confession of Christ as "Lord" in the Gospels was that of Thomas when the Risen Master appeared to Him and Thomas declared: "My Lord and my God."¹⁴ Following this, on the day of

¹³See George S. Duncan, Jesus, Son of Man (London: Nisbet & Co. Ltd., 1947), pp. 194 ff.

¹⁴John 20:28. While John alone makes mention of Thomas' doubt and confession, Matthew (28:17) and Luke (24:11,25,38,49) make mention of the fact that some of the disciples doubted. John follows his usual custom of giving one typical and named instance. The bearing of this fact on the historical value of the incidents concerned must be determined by the consideration of the whole series, and their intrinsic "probability." The attitude of Thomas is true to his character as depicted elsewhere in the gospel (11:26; 14:5).

Pentecost, Peter, stressing the message of the resurrection, declared: "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly that God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified."¹⁵ Peter, who had professed, "Thou art the Christ," now (with the crucifixion, the resurrection, and Pentecost intervening) found the language that would express Him fully. Had the Apostle Peter been re-asked the question of Jesus ("Who do men say that I am?"--Mark 8:27) no doubt he would have said: "You are the Christ and Lord."¹⁶

The formula "Jesus is Lord" was in all probability used in the earliest times as the baptismal confession--baptism being at first "in the name of the Lord Jesus" (Acts 2:38; 8:16).¹⁷ There was as yet no trace of the Trinitarian formula of Matthew 28:19 which came from later liturgical use.¹⁸ The name Kurios had its established place as well in the pre-Pauline tradition of the Eucharist as found in I Corinthians 11:23 ff.

¹⁵Acts 2:36. As represented by Peter, the church did not lose sight of the fact that the Resurrected Christ had been a man, "A man attested to you by God with mighty works and wonders and signs which God did through him" (Acts 10:38).

¹⁶We cannot say just how early the movement from "the Christ" to "the Lord" took place in the primitive church. Bousset has argued that it occurred after the Christian movement had expanded beyond the regions of Palestine and had begun to claim as its converts those from the gentile lands who were familiar with the lords of the various cults. However, vide infra.

¹⁷Cf. Acts 19:5; I Cor. 1:13.

¹⁸C. H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments, pp. 166 f., says that the early baptismal form was long recognized as valid, even after the Trinitarian form prevailed. Cf. Oscar Cullmann, Earliest Christian Confessions, trans. by J. K. S. Reid (London: Lutterworth Press, 1949), pp. 35-47.

It is also worthy of note that Peter and the other disciples accomplished miracles in the power of the Risen Lord (cf. Acts 4:10, 30).

Testimony of Paul and His Development

Christ was recognized as Lord first of all by the primitive church, but the Apostle Paul entered into this conviction. Though not the first to apply this title to Christ, Paul did not take this designation for granted, but rather accepted it and developed its use. His concept of the Lordship of Christ was not basically different from that of his fellow-believers, but it took on a deeper meaning and went beyond the content of the original faith. To the Apostle this Lordship connoted an intense personal devotion. The Risen Lord was no mere heavenly figure hidden in the heavens or clothed in unapproachable light; rather One who was living and reigning, and who sustained a warm personal relation with His loved ones. After Damascus Paul became the servant ($\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$)¹⁹ of Jesus Christ, and this Jesus was the Lord who had the life and work of His servants supremely at heart and was the One to whom Paul turned in everything that concerned his labours for his Lord.²⁰ At the same time that he

¹⁹Rom. 1:1. Cf. II Cor. 4:5; Gal. 1:10; Phil. 1:1; and similarly James 1:1; II Peter 1:1; Jude 1:1. Paul's thought of himself as a servant is probably Semitic in origin. W. Robertson, Lectures on the Religion of the Semites, new ed. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1894), pp. 63 f., says: "Where the god is conceived as a king, he will naturally be addressed as Lord, and his worshippers will be spoken of as his subjects." The Apostle very likely adapted the term $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ to the Hellenistic world because the concept of "lord" and "slave" was understood. See Adolf Deissmann, Light From the Ancient East, trans. by Lionel R. M. Strachan (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910), pp. 327-330, 353 f.

²⁰Cf. II Cor. 12:7,8.

was a slave of the Lord, he was the Lord's freedman (ἀπελευθερος . I Cor. 7:22) because he had been bought with a price (I Cor. 6:20; 7:23) and had been set free (Gal. 5:1).

To Paul, Christ's Lordship was an office and power actively exercised by the Risen One, and, as Lord, Christ meant security to the disciples against all evil that might threaten their well-being. Believing that Jesus was living and reigning with a love that was indissoluble, the Apostle burst into a song of confidence: "For I am sure that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor anything else in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. 8:38,39). His Lordship not only assured him of protection from evil, but Christ had lordly rights over him by what He had done, and was still doing, on his behalf.²¹

While Paul can think of Christ as "his Lord" it is more common to find that he refers to Christ as "our Lord" (ἡμῶν ΚΥΡΙΟΣ), showing that the Lord and the Ecclesia belong inseparably together. The Lord and His church are related to each other as the Head to the body, as the Corner-stone to the house, and as the Vine to the branches; it is impossible to think of one apart from the other. Although His Lordship extends primarily over the community, whose Head He is, all other creatures, both those in heaven and those on the earth and those under the earth, must

²¹Vide infra PART III on Soteriology.

do Him homage. According to the great Christological passage in Philippians 2:6-11, every tongue shall confess that "Jesus Christ is Lord." He is the unconditional Lord over all, whether they recognize Him as such or not, and as such He has authority over all hostile principalities and powers (I Cor. 15:24 ff.), and He was to destroy them that all opposition against the will of God should be rooted out and God be all in all, His will supreme.²²

For Paul, the confession that Jesus is the Risen Lord is the one condition of salvation: "If you confess with your lips that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved."²³ To confess Christ as Lord and to believe in His resurrection are not two different things but are basically one and the same. The significance of the confession is that when it is made it is understood to be due to the working of the Holy Spirit: "No one can say 'Jesus is Lord' except by the Holy Spirit."²⁴

To Paul (as well as the primitive community) this Lordship, which belonged to Christ as the Exalted One, was in the closest connection with

²²Cf. W. Künneth, op. cit., pp. 113, 118; Bertram Lee Woolf, "The Authority of the Risen Lord," The Congregational Quarterly, V, No. 4 (Oct., 1927), pp. 397-408.

²³Rom. 10:9. C. H. Dodd, The Epistle to the Romans (The Moffatt New Testament Commentary), London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932, p. 166, points out that this is the only passage where Paul seems to equate saving faith with belief in a certain proposition. Cf. Joel 2:32.

²⁴I Cor. 12:3; cf. also Matt. 16:17. For a thorough exposition of I Cor. 12:3 see Neill Q. Hamilton, "The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul," S.J.T. Occasional Papers, No. 6 (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd Ltd., 1957), pp. 8 f.

the historic life-work of Jesus of Nazareth, and it set in its true light the glory that existed in Jesus from the very beginning of His earthly ministry. This is seen in Paul's sermon at Antioch of Pisidia where he identifies the crucified Jesus with the One whom God raised from the dead (Acts 13:39; cf. I Cor. 1:23). "Thus," says C. A. A. Scott, "we get the earliest illustration of a phenomenon which runs through the New Testament, viz., that the church is found holding, with equal emphasis and apparently without any sense of contradiction, both the true humanity and the effective Divinity of her Lord."²⁵

As one considers Paul's concept of Christ as Lord one cannot help but notice the ease and naturalness with which Paul passes from the thought of Christ to that of God. While the Father and the Lord Christ are spoken of as two,²⁶ the action of the historic Christ is viewed as in conjunction with the activity of God, as is illustrated in the following passages: "God shows his love for us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:8); "Since we are justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 5:1); "Thanks be to God, who gives us victory through our Lord Jesus Christ" (I Cor. 15:57).²⁷ Not only are

²⁵Dominus Noster (Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons Ltd., 1918), p. 46.

²⁶Paul habitually speaks of Christ as Kurios and of the Father as *o theos*, except where he quotes the Old Testament, in which case Kurios (the Septuagint translation) is used of the Father. Cf. Lucien Cerfaux, "'Kyrios' dans les citations pauliniennes de l'Ancien Testament," in Recueil Lucien Cerfaux (Études d'Exégèse et d'Histoire Religieuse de Monseigneur Cerfaux), Tome I (Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1954), pp. 173-188.

²⁷Cf. also Rom. 1:5; 6:23; 7:25; I Thess. 5:9.

the workings of God and the Lord thought of as one, but the attitudes that men should have toward God (obedience, reverence, thankfulness, love, trust, and the feeling of complete dependence in all things²⁸) are now thought appropriate to Christ and are thus implied in the title.²⁹

This confession of Christ as "Lord" is an acknowledgment of His divinity, but Paul nevertheless does not speak of Christ as "God."³⁰ There is only one passage in the Apostle's writings which seems to show that he equates Christ and God, i. e., Romans 9:5: "... Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever" (AV) or "... Christ. God who is over all be blessed for ever" (RSV).³¹ This, however, is not conclusive since it depends on the punctuation whether the words "who is over all, God blessed for ever"³² are to be taken as a doxology to the Father³³ or as an integral part of the preceding statement about Christ. Although Paul goes so far as to suggest for Christ "equality with God" (Phil. 2;

²⁸"If the Lord wills" (I Cor. 4:19).

²⁹J. Weiss, Christ: The Beginning of Dogma, pp. 46 f.

³⁰Cf. Clement's Second Epistle to the Corinthians, I,1: "Brethren, we ought to think of Jesus as God." Cf. also Fernand Ménégoz, "Le Christ glorifié," R.H.P.R., XXI, No. 3-4 (1941), p. 212.

³¹The alternate RSV translation is "Christ, who is God over all, blessed for ever."

³²ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνες. The question cannot be answered on the basis of Greek MSS since it is a matter almost entirely of punctuation.

³³The Greek language of the passage is not in a naturally doxological form. We should expect it to begin with εὐλογητός.

5-11) and he is willing to apply to Jesus passages in the Old Testament (vide infra) in which God is alluded to under the name "the Lord," he apparently shrinks from actually calling Christ "God." Certainly there is not sufficient evidence here in Romans 9:5 to insist that Paul is equating Christ and God. He to whom we are subject, answers the Apostle, is Himself subject to God: "the head of every man is Christ . . . and the head of Christ is God" (I Cor. 11:3). God is consistently referred to as the "God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,"³⁴ but this subjection is at the same time consistent with an equality with God inasmuch as in mind and heart the will of the Son is absolutely one with the Father. The very basis of His Lordship is His perfection as the Son of God, His full participation in the very life of God qualifying Him to represent the Father and to be the instrument of the Father's saving will. Paul's conjunction of God and Christ in his stated greetings to the churches indicates his belief that a co-partnership of divine power and honour was included in the exaltation of Christ as Lord, and the Apostle did not consciously face the possibility that through the honouring of Christ (along with that to God) pure monotheism might be prejudiced. Indeed he erected a bar against all such inferences: "For although there may be so-called gods in heaven or on earth . . . yet for us there is one God, the Father, from whom are all things and for whom we exist, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and through whom we exist."³⁵

³⁴Rom. 15; II Cor. 1:3; Col. 1:3; Eph. 1:3.

³⁵I Cor. 8:5-6. See J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christiani-

THE USE OF THE TITLE "LORD" IN THE WORSHIP OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH

In addition to being baptized in His name, as we saw above, the disciples' devotion to the Risen Lord permeated the whole of their lives. They sought to walk in the "way of the Lord" as they had been "instructed" (Acts 18:25), and thus they were to "remember the words of the Lord Jesus" (Acts 20:35). This devotion was expressed further in several aspects of their worship of the Lord: (1) in connection with the "Lord's day" on which they met to worship; (2) the fact that prayer was directed to Christ as Lord; (3) the "Lord's Supper."

The Lord's Day

The day on which the disciples met for worship is related to their concept of the Risen Lord. From Acts 20:7 and I Corinthians 16:2 we learn that they met on "the first day of the week"--i.e. Sunday.³⁶ The news of

ty. II, pp. 471 f.

The above interpretation of Rom. 9:5 seems conclusive, but William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, The Epistle to the Romans (The International Critical Commentary), 5th ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908), pp. 233 ff., argue for the alternative way of taking this passage, i. e. that Paul does equate God and Christ. Cf. Hans Lietzmann, An Die Römer (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament), 2nd ed. (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1919), p. 86, who adopts the same view as the RSV translators in making the reference a doxology to God.

³⁶The "first day of the week" would correspond to our Sunday, whether in part or in full depending on the method of reckoning time. According to Jewish rules the first day of the week began on Saturday evening at sunset and ended at sunset on Sunday, while according to the Greco-Roman method one day ends and another begins at midnight. In Acts 20:7 ff. the context of the passage seems to suggest that Luke employed the Greco-Roman method because of his distinction between "the first day of the week" (the evening when Paul preached) and "the morrow" (the dawn

Jesus' resurrection had naturally drawn them together on that memorable "first day of the week" (Easter Sunday), and in John 20:26 we learn that they were assembled on the next Sunday. This "first day" is a special day marked out by the Lord's repeated appearances, the coming of the Holy Spirit, and the final sanction of it as devoted to the Lord ("the Lord's Day," Rev. 1:10). At first there was no special name for the day for it was still called "the first day of the week," according to the Jewish chronology.

There is no explicit record of when or why they turned to Sunday as their special day of worship,³⁷ and when we consider how jealous the Jews were of their sacred traditions, it is astonishing that they should have transferred their public services from the seventh day to the first day of the week. The only reasonable account of the change was to make this day

of the next day when Paul departed). This evidence leads Lake and Cadbury to say: "It is hard to avoid the conclusion that the meeting in Troas was on Sunday, not Saturday evening" (The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I, The Acts of the Apostles, ed. by F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, IV, London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1933, p. 255). Cf. also F. F. Bruce, Commentary on the Book of the Acts (London: Marshall Morgan & Scott, Ltd., 1954), pp. 407 f.

McCasland (The Resurrection of Jesus, pp. 177 ff.) thinks there is good evidence that the early disciples had the custom of meeting for worship at dawn on Sunday. Cf. Acts 20:11; Pliny (Letters, Bk.X.96, c. 110 A. D.); Tertullian (Ad nationes I,13; Apology 16). Cyprian (Treatises, IV,35) says: "For we must also pray in the morning, that the Lord's resurrection may be celebrated by morning prayer." (As cited by McCasland.)

³⁷It is impossible to say when the disciples made a complete break with the synagogue. The fact that Paul had to take a stand against a legalistic observance (Gal. 4:10; Col. 2:16) indicates the hold which the Sabbath retained at the time. Cf. S. V. McCasland, "The Origin of the Lord's Day," J.B.L., XLIX (1930), p. 68.

("the Lord's Day") a memorial of Christ's resurrection.³⁸ By His death and resurrection Christ had fulfilled the ultimate purpose underlying God's institution of the original Sabbath, and had ushered in a new aeon. His resurrection is the anticipation of this new age--the final Sabbath rest.³⁹

³⁸Cf. Ignatius' The Epistle to the Magnesians: "If, therefore, they who were under the older dispensation came into a new hope, no longer keeping the Sabbath, but now living in observance of the Lord's day, on which day also our life rose through him and through his death, which certain deny, through which mystery we have received faith" (9:1). The Epistle of Barnabas (15:8, 9) states: "And the Lord declares his rejection of the Jewish new-moons and sabbaths. The true Sabbath therefore is the seventh of the thousand years, and as this commences with the eighth day [since the day followed the Sabbath, or the seventh day of the week], the day of Christ's resurrection and ascension, we celebrate it in gladness." B. W. Bacon, Jesus the Son of God (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1911), p. 65, thinks that originally the Lord's Day commemorated the day of Jesus' enthronement at the right hand of God. There is the possibility that the designation "Lord's Day" was originally eschatological, the coming day of Christ's parousia. On this point cf. Martin Werner, The Formation of Christian Dogma, trans. by S. G. F. Brandon (London: Adams & Charles Black, 1957), p. 32.

³⁹See Cullmann (Early Christian Worship, pp. 88 ff.) who develops this idea in his discussion of John 5:17 ("My Father is working still, and I am working"). Cf. also Hebrews, chapters 3 and 4. Alfred Loisy, op. cit. (who thinks of the resurrection not as a definite event which can be assigned to a definite time or place but rather as the creation of the early disciples) reasons that Sunday was chosen as a special day not because it was necessarily the day of the resurrection, but because "it was the first of the seven, the Chief Day, the day of the Sun, honoured as such, and not by pagans only" (pp. 224 f.). He further suggests: "And was there not an analogy perceptible to all, and spontaneously accepted by all, between the risen Christ in his glory, and the sun in heaven and the solar gods abounding throughout the east? . . . The Christ in his glory was thought of as a Being of Light; light was the substance of his being" (p. 225). ". . . The glory of the Sun's day proved irresistible, and this attraction, coupled with the growth of reaction against purely Jewish observances, soon shifted the Christian Passover to the Sunday following the Jewish celebration" (p. 227).

As stated, Loisy believes that the primitive Christians first chose

But we must note that there was no immediate transfer from the seventh day to the first, nor is the first ever called Sabbath day. The Jewish Christians for a time continued to observe the Sabbath and took the liberty of speaking and worshiping in the synagogue.⁴⁰ But soon they came to regard the first day as unequivocally the special and honoured day for the Christian assembly. After the separation from the synagogue, Gentile Christians would have no reason for observing the Jewish Sabbath, because formerly they had not been observing the Sabbath as such, but merely sharing in synagogue services.⁴¹ Full attention was now turned to "the first day of the week" and the canon of the New Testament does not close without stamping this day as "the Lord's Day" (Rev. 1:10). Thus we see that the Lord's day is a special day to which the primitive community spontaneously turned for worship and the memorialization of the resurrection of Jesus. Cullmann says: "Each Lord's Day was an Easter Festival,

Sunday as the Day of the Lord because of its importance over the other days of the week, and he asserts that it was only later that Sunday was adopted as the Christian Holy Day. "Once adopted as the Christian Holy Day, the justification of the usage would be complete when the Christian believed that on that day, and none other of the seven, his Lord rose from the dead. It was bound to come to that as soon as the Christians had to justify their observance of Sunday, and the more inevitably perhaps, when, under pressure of a later demand for proofs that Jesus really rose from the dead, the attempt was made to construct a co-ordinated story of the apparitions under a scheme of time and place" (p. 226). In light of our Introduction, our statements above and below, Loisy's view of the resurrection fact and the Lord's day observance is not valid.

⁴⁰ Acts 9:20; 13:5,14; 14:1; 17:10,17; 18:4,19,26; 19:8.

⁴¹ Frank Stagg, The Book of Acts (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1955), pp. 210 f.

since this was not yet confined to one single Sunday in the year."⁴²

Prayer Directed to Christ as Lord

Because Christ had been exalted as Lord, prayer was addressed to Him directly. Indeed, He was the object of worship to such an extent that the Christians of Damascus were described by Ananias as those "who call upon thy name."⁴³ In his hour of martyrdom Stephen prayed: "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," and, "Lord, do not hold this sin against them."⁴⁴ This attitude of prayer is seen also in the primitive community's calling on Him as Lord: $\mu\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\ \acute{\iota}\theta\acute{\iota}\ \ (\ \chi\ \eta\ \chi\ \eta\ \eta\ \eta\)$. "Lord, come").⁴⁵ The fact that this, the oldest liturgical prayer of the early Christian community, is left untranslated by Paul and that it continued in its original Aramaic form until the writing of the Didache

⁴²Early Christian Worship, p. 11. As stated above (see note 38), Martin Werner thinks of the Lord's Day as an eschatological expression of the early church's looking forward to the return of their Messiah from heaven. In this connection he states: "... the connection with the expectation of the Parousia with the celebration of the Lord's Day was substituted by the idea that the future Coming of Christ would in any case happen at Easter, when the memory of the Resurrection of Jesus was celebrated with special emphasis. For how long the Parousia was really earnestly expected each year at Eastertide is difficult to tell, but it is worth noting that this conviction clearly preserved itself on into the 3rd century." See Werner's footnote for reference to Epistula Apostolorum, Tertullian, Origen, and Hippolytus.

⁴³Acts 9:14. Cf. I Cor. 1:2: "To the church of God which is at Corinth, to those sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints together with all those who in every place call on the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, both their Lord and ours."

⁴⁴Acts 7:59,60.

⁴⁵I Cor. 16:22. The indicative, $\mu\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \acute{\iota}\theta\acute{\iota}\ \ (\ \chi\ \eta\ \chi\ \eta\ \eta\ \eta\)$, "Our Lord is coming," is the alternate interpretation. Cf. Didache 10:6

(cf. 10:6) shows the extraordinarily important role which it must have played. From the above passage in the Didache we learn that it was said in particular at the end of the meal in connection with the eucharistic liturgy. It is thus probably related to the disciples' fellowship meal,⁴⁶ and, as they gathered for the celebration of this meal, it is to be expected that they prayed for their Lord's coming.⁴⁷

Paul says in Romans 10:13 that "Everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord will be saved." The fact that they called upon the name of the Lord is a common mark by which they are distinguished and is a striking testimony to the supremacy of Christ in their lives. Thus in their personal devotion they regarded God and Christ side by side, and their prayers to Christ were prayers in their fullest expression--not simply reverent adorations and thanksgivings, but prayers involving earnest requests as well. Stephen's prayer, directed to the Lord Jesus, requested that the Lord receive his spirit and that the sins of the persecutors be not held against them (Acts 7:60). Paul specifies an occasion when he requested the Lord three times that the thorn of his flesh might be removed (II Cor. 12:8). On another occasion Paul invokes the blessings of the Lord on behalf of the welfare of the Thessalonian Congregation (I Thess.

(μαρτυρεῖς Θεῷ) and the corresponding Greek phrase ἐπεὶ κύριε Ἰησοῦ in Rev. 22:20. On purely linguistic grounds the form can be equally well translated as the indicative but its usage in Rev. 22:20 shows that it was probably used in the imperative sense. Cf. K. G. Kuhn, "μαρτυρεῖς Θεῷ," T.W.N.T., IV, pp. 470 ff.; John A. T. Robinson, "Traces of a Liturgical Sequence in I Cor. 16:20-24," J.T.S., IV, Pt. 1 (April, 1953), p. 39.

⁴⁶Deissmann, Light From the Ancient East, p. 118.

⁴⁷Cf. Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, pp. 13 f.

3:12; cf. II Thess. 3:3, 5).

The disciples did not think it derogatory to God, the source of all blessings, to ask petitions from their "Lord." Furthermore, the fact that they prayed to Christ does not mean that the disciples thought of Him as more accessible than the Father, but is an expression of the naturalness with which they related the activity of God to that of Christ. They knew of no other God save the God who was one with Christ and Christ with Him, and in turning in prayer to Christ they were conscious that they were drawing near to God. They seem to have had no consciousness of any need which Jesus could not and did not satisfy.⁴⁸

"Calling upon the Lord" is not only common in the prayer life of individuals but it has a very significant place in public worship as well. This is notably seen in the use of the phrase "in his name" which accompanies prayers and doxologies addressed to God.⁴⁹ Prayers are offered to God "through him" (δι' αὐτοῦ) and Paul says, probably in reference to liturgical usage, "That is why we utter the Amen through him, to the glory of God."⁵⁰

The Lord's Supper

The disciples were partakers of the "Lord's Supper" (κυριᾶκόν

⁴⁸G. J. Case, "ΚΥΡΙΟΣ as a title for Christ," J.B.L., XXVI (1907), pp. 151-161, says that prayer addressed to Jesus implies only "that God and Christ have similar position in relation to man," not that Jesus is treated as God. (As cited by B. W. Bacon, op. cit., p. 61.)

⁴⁹Eph. 5:20; cf. Eph. 3:21; John 14:13; 15:16; 16:24, 26.

⁵⁰II Cor. 1:20. Cf. Alfred Plummer, Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (The International Critical Commentary), Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1915, p. 38.

ΣΕΙΤΤΥΟΝ , I Cor. 11:20) which had been instituted by the Lord Himself (vs. 23).⁵¹ While the Supper had eschatological significance in that it proclaimed the "Lord's death until he comes" (I Cor. 11:26),⁵² it was also related to the believers' communion with Christ. As the Body of Christ they experience the spiritual reality of their faith union with Him. The Supper sets forth that which has taken place through faith, the dying with Christ to the world and to sin, and the living again to God and to righteousness. The Supper not only proclaims Christ's death, but likewise His resurrection and His second coming--all together three events which Beasley Murray calls "the three inseparable moments of Christ's redemption."⁵³ Thus this fellowship meal was not simply a memorial of death, but a commemoration of death conquered by life, and is unintelligible without their faith in the Risen Lord.

The Lord's Supper and the Resurrection Appearances. In his thought-provoking discussion, "La signification de la Sainte-Cène dans le chris-

⁵¹The day designated for the Lord's Supper seems definitely to have been on the day of the resurrection, Sunday (vide supra pp. 108 ff.). This would naturally imply telling the story which gave the day its meaning. Cf. Didache 14; Pliny's Letters, Book X, 96.

⁵²For the view that originally the Lord's Supper was at first purely eschatological cf. Martin Werner, op. cit., p. 32.

⁵³Christ Is Alive!, p. 132. As noted by Beasley Murray, Thornton (op. cit., p. 331) states: "What began in baptism is carried on continuously through the sacrament of the eucharist. The process [by] which union by growth involves is the process of becoming 'united by growth' with the likeness of Christ's resurrection. Only thus shall we be conformed to the image of God's Son so that our adoption at last corresponds to actuality." Cf. Martin Werner, op. cit., p. 186.

tianisme primitif," Cullmann has emphasized the importance of the post-resurrection appearances in the celebration of the Eucharist.⁵⁴ He thinks that it was characteristic of the appearances that they occurred during the course of the Meals (cf. Acts 10:41).⁵⁵ He maintains further:

Il paraît donc vraisemblable de supposer que l'idée de la résurrection du Christ était, dans l'esprit des disciples, liée au souvenir du ou des repas pris avec leur Maître pendant la période qui va de Pâques à la Pentecôte. . . . La certitude de la résurrection, tel était le motif religieux par excellence de la Cène primitive. L'expérience de la présence du Ressuscité au sein de l'assemblée des fidèles se répétait . . . ils savaient que la Ressuscité manifesterait sa présence, d'une manière moins visible qu'autrefois, mais non moins réelle.⁵⁶

On the basis of Luke 24:30 ff., John 21:12 ff., Acts 1:4, Acts 10:41, and Revelation 3:20, Cullmann concludes that the celebration of the Meal had its direct origin, not in the fact that the disciples met to eat the body and drink the blood of their crucified Master, but rather in the feeling that they were eating with the Risen Christ, and that He was really present with them as He had been on Easter Sunday.⁵⁷ The "exuberant joy" (cf. Acts

⁵⁴R.H.P.R., 1936, pp. 1-22. The importance of this essay has long been overlooked by English-speaking scholars. However, see the recent translation in Essays on the Lord's Supper (Ecumenical Studies in Worship, No. 1), by Oscar Cullmann and F. J. Leenhardt, trans. by J. G. Davies (London: Lutterworth Press, 1958). Cf. also Cullmann's Early Christian Worship, pp. 14 ff.

⁵⁵"La signification de la Sainte-Cène . . .," op. cit., p. 8.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 9. Cullmann (p. 11) points out that Maranatha!, the prayer formula connected with the Supper (vide supra pp. 112 f.), rightly refers to the Risen Christ, the Living Christ, and the Coming Christ. Cf. F. C. Grant, An Introduction to New Testament Thought (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1950), p. 293; Alexander B. Macdonald, Christian Worship in the Primitive Church (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1934), pp. 148 f.; W. Künneth, op. cit., Vierte Auflage, pp. 191 f.

⁵⁷"La signification de la Sainte-Cène . . .," op. cit., p. 14. Cf.

2:46) that prevailed at the Meals was aroused by their remembrance of the occasions when the Risen Christ had meals with them.

The "Last" Supper and the Origin of the Eucharist. The above view has been subject to criticism, e. g. by Professor F. J. Leenhardt.⁵⁸ Cullmann has acknowledged Leenhardt's criticism, and, in our judgment, has rightly and adequately defended his position. While Professor Cullmann believes that Christ's post-resurrection appearances are the "direct" origin of the Eucharist, he does not overlook the due importance of the "Last" Supper.

This Last Supper of the historical Jesus is certainly the original source of the community Feast, in so far as it was in remembrance of that Last Supper that the disciples came together after the resurrection to eat the meal at which the risen Christ appeared to them. In Jesus' words at the Last Supper also, as they are reported in the Synoptic Gospels, there is already present the connection with the thought of the Messianic meal ('till I shall eat it anew') and further with the thought of the new covenant of communion which is now founded through the death of Christ.⁵⁹

the similar thought by Knodt (Die Gestaltung des Abendmahls, pp. 7-9): "The holy Feast of the original Church is not a commemoration of the martyred body of Jesus, but of the transfigured Body of the Resurrection, not a Passion-mysticism, but an Easter joy." (As cited by N. Arseniev, We Beheld His Glory, p. 108).

⁵⁸Le Sacrement de la Sainte Cène, 1948, pp. 64 ff. (As cited by Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, p. 17, note 1).

⁵⁹Ibid., pp. 17 f. Leenhardt identifies Cullmann's view with that expressed earlier (1926) by Hans Lietzmann, Messe und Herrenmahl. Cullmann (p. 17, note 1), however, objects to Lietzmann's position on this very ground that Lietzmann does not give the "Last" Supper its due rôle in the institution of the Eucharist. He states: "... the common origin of both types [He refers to Lietzmann's distinction between the early communal type of Supper as found in the Didache, which, in Lietzmann's opinion, has no connection with the death of Christ, and to the Pauline type in I Cor. 11 which is connected with Christ's death] is to be sought in the historical Jesus' Last Supper, even if only indirectly in the case of the first

The primitive community so emphasized the post-resurrection appearances in its celebration of the Supper that Paul felt it necessary to recall the thought of the vicarious death of Christ which had fallen to the background. Cullmann goes on to say: "In doing so, however, he [Paul] did not drop the eucharistic thoughts of the early community concerning the future coming of Christ and the present fellowship with him already realized in the gathering for a common meal . . ."⁶⁰

To be sure, Cullmann's view (which is shared by A. J. B. Higgins⁶¹) takes into account, much more than is usually done, the close relationship of the first eucharistic feasts with the Easter meals--an emphasis which, in our opinion, is much needed and deserves thoughtful consideration. For the purpose of this thesis, Cullmann's emphasis is important in that it shows that the early disciples' communion with Christ, as expressed in the Lord's Supper, was a fellowship with the Risen and Living Christ.

type" [i. e. the early communal Supper]. On Lietzmann's view see A. J. B. Higgins, The Lord's Supper in the New Testament (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 6), London: S.C.M. Press, Ltd., 1952, pp. 57 ff.; cf. also the recent translation of Lietzmann's work, Mass and Lord's Supper: A Study in the History of the Liturgy, trans., with appendices, by Dorothea H. G. Reeve, introduction and supplementary essay by R. D. Richardson (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953-not completed).

⁶⁰Early Christian Worship, p. 18.

⁶¹The Lord's Supper in the New Testament, pp. 61 ff. K. Barth, Dogmatics in Outline, trans. by G. T. Thomson (London: S.C.M. Press, 1949), p. 155, says: "The Lord's Supper ought to be more firmly regarded from the Easter standpoint, than is generally the case. It is not primarily a mourning or funeral meal, but the anticipation of the marriage feast of the Lamb." Cf. Floyd V. Filson, Jesus Christ The Risen Lord, p. 220; Kunneth, op. cit., pp. 191 f.

WORSHIP OF CHRIST AS A CULTUS

The affirmation of the divinity of Christ is essential to the Christian message, and whatever else is implied by "divinity," at least it means that there was expressed toward Him an attitude of mind and spirit that is appropriate to a man's relation to God. The extent to which Jesus was actually the object of worship in the primitive community is difficult to establish because there is not enough known of the liturgical practice of that period. But certainly to call upon the name that is "above every name" (Phil. 2:9) is the invocation to One who is in a different category from man. In some sense Jesus was now to the disciples what Yahweh was to Israel, and they felt constrained to worship and serve this One who had earned the place of sovereignty in their hearts.

A. E. J. Rawlinson has said that the disciples' devotion to their Lord expressed itself in the nature of a ^{form} "cultus." "The cult of the Lord Jesus was inherent in Christianity from the beginning," and he goes on to say, "the eventual formulation of an explicit doctrine of our Lord's deity as the incarnate Son of God was necessitated by the fact that it provided the only ultimate intellectual justification of such a cultus which was compatible with monotheism."⁶² While this "cult" emphasis is valid in

⁶²The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ (London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1926), pp. 236 f. Cf. A. M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors (London: Nicholson and Watson, 1940), p. 101. See A. Deissmann's lengthy discussion of this problem in Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History, trans. by William E. Wilson, 2nd ed. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1926), pp. 114 ff. He distinguishes between "cultus" and

showing the ardent devotion of the early church to Christ, it is to be questioned whether the church's devotion was of the nature of a cult. In Rudolf Bultmann's discussion of this problem he defines "cult" as follows:

1. Cult means human action--especially sacrifice, but also other acts--which influences the deity, disposes Him graciously toward the congregation, and makes His power effective for it. 2. This action takes place at fixed, holy times, in a holy place, and according to holy rules or rites. 3. This action is performed by persons of special quality, priests, who mediate between the deity and the congregation; or, in case the congregation participates more than just passively, the action is led by such persons.⁶³

If the above is a proper definition of cult, then one must agree with Bultmann that these meetings and services of the early church obviously cannot be termed originally cultic.⁶⁴ Even if one says that their piety can be likened to that of a cult for their god, then one should also add that this "cult" was "essentially religious rather than theological, and spiritual rather than intellectual."⁶⁵ Thus as a title, "Lord" does not stand primarily for a doctrine or dogma but for an attitude toward Him.

"cult." The former has reference to the "Solemnities practised in worship by an organized religious body and of the formal expression of these solemnities. That is the narrower idea for which in German the word Kultus is used and should be retained. Cult in the wider meaning is what lies behind the cultus as its spiritual precondition . . . " (p. 115).

⁶³Theology of the New Testament, I, p. 121.

⁶⁴Ibid., pp. 121 ff.

⁶⁵Kirsopp Lake, The Stewardship of Faith (London: Christophers, 1915), pp. 95 f. Cf. D. M. Baillie, God Was In Christ, 2nd ed. (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1955), p. 67: "We never find anything in the New Testament that could be called a Jesus-cult, or a Christology interested simply in the question of who or what Jesus was, apart from the action of God the Father. Whatever Jesus was or did, in His life, in His teaching, in His cross and passion, in His resurrection and ascension and exaltation, it is really God that did it in Jesus: that is how the New Testament speaks."

As C. A. A. Scott says, "It was an attitude of devotion, submission, expectation, such as none of God's people had ever adopted, except to God Himself."⁶⁶

BACKGROUND OF THE USE OF KYRIOS

This practice of referring to the Risen Christ as Kurios has been traced by scholars to different sources. Since Wilhelm Bousset's stimulating book, Kyrios Christos,⁶⁷ the question has been eagerly debated whether the title arose spontaneously in the Jewish-Christian communities, or whether it was taken over from the Hellenistic world with its religious associations and thus applied to Jesus. Bousset has collected examples which illustrate the use of the title in reference to a number of the Hellenized cults, more particularly in Syria, Asia Minor, and Egypt.⁶⁸ As found in connection with the mystery religions, the title is ascribed to the hero-god or goddess (Isis, Osiris, Serapis, Mithras, etc.), a fact which Paul appears to have taken note of in I Corinthians 8:5. The title is also ascribed to deified Roman Emperors (Tiberius, Nero, Domitian, etc.),

⁶⁶Op. cit., p. 173.

⁶⁷2nd ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921). For a thorough and just presentation and criticism of Bousset's views see Rawlinson, op. cit., pp. 231-237; G. Vos, "The Kyrios Christos Controversy," Princeton Theological Review, XV (1917), pp. 21-89.

⁶⁸Op. cit., pp. 91-101.

as has been pointed out by Adolf Deissmann.⁶⁹ Hence at the birth of Christianity, Deissmann says that the term "Lord" was a "divine predicate intelligible to the whole Eastern world."⁷⁰ But the fact that Kurios was in common usage at the time does not necessarily imply Bousset's hypothesis (followed by Bultmann) that the New Testament use of the title is derived from any Hellenistic source, particularly that of the mystery religions. This view, as Vincent Taylor has stated, must be rejected because it assumes that Paul's theology is predominantly Greek while basically it is Jewish, and also because it assumes a tension, or a gulf, between Christological beliefs of the Hellenistic and Jewish-Christian communities, of which there is no New Testament evidence.⁷¹ But the main argument against the view of Bousset is the fact that almost certainly before the Gentile mission had been inaugurated Aramaic Christianity confessed Jesus as Lord: Marana tha, "Lord, come." As we have seen

⁶⁹Light From the Ancient East, pp. 355 ff. See also Gustaf Dalman, The Words of Jesus, trans. by D. M. Day (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902), p. 330. It is interesting to note that Cullmann connects the formula "Jesus Christ is Lord" with the Roman persecution (cf. Earliest Christian Confessions, pp. 27 f.). The Romans had demanded that the Christians say that Caesar was "Lord," but because there is but one true Lord the faithful disciples refused to acknowledge Caesar as such, and thus this Christian confession took on a stereotyped form. Cf. Deissmann, Light From the Ancient East, pp. 346, 357 ff. While the Roman persecution no doubt played a part in the Christians' use of the confession, judging from Paul's letters it is to be questioned that the persecution was the origin of the confession. Vide infra.

⁷⁰Ibid., p. 354.

⁷¹Taylor, The Names of Jesus, pp. 47 f. Cf. John Knox, The Early Church and the Coming Great Church, p. 71.

above, this was the Aramaic prayer-formula used in connection with the Lord's Supper. Werner Foerster's judgment seems sound when he states that since all the Aramaic words preserved for us in the Gospels are derived from the Palestinian community and have their original meaning, there is not sufficient ground for denying that the word Marana tha sprang from the same source.⁷²

A further difficulty for Bousset's theory is the Christian use of Psalm 110 (cf. Mark 12:35-37; Acts 2:30 ff.), which was very early given a Christological interpretation.⁷³ As far back as the time when this Psalm was written the word *Kurios* was used to describe the majesty of the king who was the subject of divine favour.⁷⁴ We do not know the extent of the use of this Psalm by the early church in describing Jesus as Lord, but

⁷² "ΚΥΡΙΟΣ," T.W.N.T., III, p. 1094. In addition, R. J. Knowling (The Witness of the Epistles, p. 15) has suggested that there is some relation of the origin of the title "Lord" with the fact of Paul's speaking of "James the Lord's brother" (Gal. 1:19). He thinks that the natural implication of this verse is that the "Lord's brother" was a customary designation of James, and hence that the title "Lord" was current in the Jerusalem Church. While this argument cannot be conclusive, it does point strongly to the prevalence of the use of the title "Lord" as applied to Jesus in the early Jerusalem Church.

⁷³ Cf. W. Stewart McCullough, "The Book of Psalms," I.B., IV, pp. 587 f.; Reginald Glanville, "The Psalms and the Resurrection of Jesus," London Quarterly and Holborn Review, CLXXVI (Sixth Series), Vol. XX (July, 1951), pp. 212 f.

⁷⁴ Bousset (op. cit., p. 43) admits that the gospel section Mark 12:35-37 must be assigned to early Christianity, though he regards it as containing the theology of the early church ("Gemeindetheologie") rather than any actual words of the Lord. See Rawlinson, The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ, pp. 335 f., for a full treatment of Bousset's view on the use of Psalm 110 in connection with the Lordship of Christ.

surely it must have facilitated this usage, and played an important rôle in the post-resurrection use of the title.

In considering the background of the use of Kurios we must take into consideration the significance of the Old Testament equivalent. The figure of "Lord," Adonai (אָדֹנָי , pluralis majestatis) is the customary one in the Israelite religion to describe the Godhead who rules over the world. In the Septuagint, Kurios is commonly used to translate the Hebrew Adonai, and what is more important, it is the usual euphemistic synonym for the vocalization of the personal and sacred name יהוה.⁷⁵ As applied to God, with or without the article, Kurios denotes His power over the world and men, as the Creator, the Ruler, and the Giver of life and death. The fact that this title, which is regularly used of Yahweh, is applied to Christ is a most arresting one, and it is unthinkable that these early followers of Jesus would have dared do such a thing had they not been convinced that Jesus was in some way a revelation of God, an agent through whom Yahweh's Lordship was to be established and administered among men. Nor is it probable that this title of Lord would have been applied to Jesus unless He had been recognized as the object of veneration in personal experience and in worship.

The significant thing is that Paul transfers to Christ not only the

⁷⁵It is not limited, however, to this religious usage, being freely employed as a term of honour for angels and men (cf. Gen. 19:2; 27:29; etc.). As applied to men, the term means "lord," "master," "owner," "ruler," and is often used as a respectful mode of address.

title Kurios, but some of the most striking attributes which had been associated with it in the Old Testament. Having in mind the traditional description of God's faithful people as "they who call upon the name of the Lord," Paul applied the phrase to those who called on Christ.⁷⁶ In the same context (Rom. 10:11), Paul transfers the language of Isaiah 28:16 to the Lord Jesus ("No one who believes in him will be put to shame"). Isaiah (45:23) proclaimed that every knee shall bow to Yahweh, and Paul (Phil. 2:10, 11) says that this same devotion is due to the Lord Jesus. Again, "the day of the Lord," which in the Old Testament had meant "the day of Yahweh" (Amos 5:18; Joel 2:1), is now used by Paul to signify "the day of Christ" (I Thess. 5:2; cf. I Cor. 5:5; Phil. 1:6, 10, etc.), and in II Thessalonians 1:9 the traditional imagery of the day of Yahweh is used to describe the day of Christ.⁷⁷

When we bear in mind the above evidence, it seems clear that "it is unnecessary and unsound to trace back to the mystery religions Pauline conceptions whose true ancestry might more profitably be looked for in the Old Testament."⁷⁸ It is quite possible that within Judaism the way had been prepared for the transference of the title to Christ. And since Kurios was in the reading and thinking vocabulary of the Gentile Chris-

⁷⁶Joel 2:32; Rom. 10:13; cf. I Cor. 1:2.

⁷⁷Cf. C. A. A. Scott, Christianity According to St Paul (Cambridge: University Press, 1927), pp. 253 f.; S. J. Case, "ΚΤΡΙΟΣ as a Title for Christ," op. cit., pp. 158 ff.

⁷⁸James S. Stewart, A Man In Christ, p. 73. Cf. also W. Foerster, op. cit., p. 1094.

tians, it is understandable why this title would have been intelligible to them, and thus used to describe the glory of their Risen Lord. The fact that there was never any disagreement between the primitive Christian community and Paul on the ground of Christology is decidedly significant. The Jerusalem Church was perplexed about Paul in some ways but was not troubled in thinking that he was departing from the original Gospel as he developed his Christology. It is hardly probable that Paul, or the primitive Christian community (who were either steeped in monotheism from Jewish ancestry or had the zeal of new converts for the Old Testament monotheism) would have taken over this essential element of their faith from paganism.

CONCLUSION

As we have seen, the faith in the Risen Jesus is now expressed in two creedal formulae: "Jesus is the Christ," and "Jesus is Lord." Gradually these two expressions of the primitive church become fused into one full title--"Our Lord Jesus Christ"--which we so often find in Paul's epistles.⁷⁹ It appears in the Apostle's introductory blessing (e. g. Rom. 1:7; I Cor. 1:3), in solemn, exalted sentences and concluding sections (Rom. 5:11, 21; 6:23; 7:25; 8:39; 15:6; I Cor. 1:10; 15:37, often with

⁷⁹This is not to say that the concept of the Messiahship was absorbed into that of the Lordship or vice versa, but it does show that these two aspects of the Person of Christ were closely associated. Cf. Jean-Louis Leuba, New Testament Pattern, trans. by Harold Knight (London: Lutterworth Press, 1953), p. 48, where he discusses the relation of the Messiahship and the Lordship of Christ.

5, 6), and in the concluding blessing (the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ--Rom. 16:20; I Cor. 16:23; II Cor. 13:13, etc.). Weiss thinks that because of the formal and solemn character of the designation, in all probability it was not originated by the Apostle but taken over from the customary usage of the primitive community.⁸⁰

It is quite evident from the above that as a title "Lord" played a central rôle in the Apostles' estimate of the Person of Christ. As a result of the resurrection the disciples re-appraised the life of the Exalted One, and when they now spoke of Him as "Lord" the title implied more than respect; it denoted a devotion to Christ as that expressed to God. At the least it was a title of deity; at the most it signified the source of their salvation. To this One who had lived as man and who had been exalted as Lord, the disciples offered prayer; they partook of His Supper, and met to worship Him on a special day. In the true sense of the word, He was their Lord and they were His people.

⁸⁰Cf. J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, II, p. 455.

III: THE SON OF GOD

In addition to being revealed as "the Christ," "the Lord," the resurrection proclaims Jesus the "Son of God" as we learn from Paul's opening words in his Epistle to the Romans: ". . . concerning his Son, who was descended from David according to the flesh and designated Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness by [his] resurrection from the dead" (Rom. 1:3, 4). At the first mention of the name of Christ in this Epistle, that which leaps to the Apostle's mind is not the treasure of Christ's teaching or example, but the thought of His resurrection, and of that as attesting His divine Sonship.

In his apostolic salutation to the Roman Church, which he had not yet visited, Paul presented his credentials with solemnity because he wished to win the Church's support for his proposed extension of missionary work. He makes it clear that he is no adventurer, as his enemies might allege, but rather a true apostle, entrusted like the prophets of old, with a divine message. The Apostle thus takes occasion to give a brief statement of the faith which he preaches, and which unites him with his readers.¹ He states that his gospel, which is the fulfilment of earlier

¹C. H. Dodd, The Epistle to the Romans, p. 5. See Anton Fridrichsen, "The Apostle and his Message," op. cit., p. 20, note 19, where he disagrees with Dodd (and other interpreters) that Rom. 1:4 represents a confession of faith familiar to the Romans. In reference to Dodd's position, Fridrichsen states: "I think this is to underrate the polemical strain in Romans."

promises and hence preserves the continuity of the Old Testament tradition, centres around one person--the Son of God. It is noteworthy that the first thing that Paul preached after his conversion was "He [Jesus] is the Son of God" (Acts 9:20). This confession was undoubtedly in the faith of the Apostles before Paul's statement,² but though inherited by the Apostle, he did not take it for granted because it became a hallmark of his preaching throughout his ministry.³ In the introductory remarks to the Church it is not Paul's purpose to expound the doctrine of the Sonship but to place on record this truth which he and his readers alike

²Cf. Acts 8:37. When the eunuch desired to be baptized, "... Philip said, 'If you believe with all your heart, you may.' And he replied, 'I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.'" This verse, included in the Western text, is not supported by the best manuscripts. Though the verse is probably a scribe's addition to the text, it does accurately interpret the thought of Philip and the Ethiopian, and it also gives us an important example of the primitive baptismal confession. It is noticeable that the confession is an expansion, not of the Trinitarian formula, but of the primitive "in the name of Jesus Christ" formula that we have noted earlier. This confession is one of the most ancient confessions of faith which we know. See Cullmann, Earliest Christian Confessions, especially p. 20. Bousset (Kyrios Christos, pp. 52-57) thought that Paul was the first so to describe Christ and thus that the title was a creation of Paul. A. M. Hunter (Paul and His Predecessors, pp. 109 f.) says: "But it was only by a tour de force of German critical legerdemain that he [Bousset] was able to defend his assertion." Professor Hunter (p. 110) goes on to say that the stories of the baptism and temptation are surely corroborative evidence--even if they represent Palestinian Gemeinde-theologie--that the primitive church did so designate Jesus.

³Paul uses the phrase "The Son of God" four times; "His Son" eleven times; and "The Son" two times. For the most part Paul only employs the phrase where the turn of the sentence suggests it to him, when he has to declare the relation of Jesus to God, except here in Rom. 1:4; Gal. 2:20; II Cor. 1:19. With scarcely an exception, it is only used in the portions of the letters that are marked by special elevation of style.

regarded as fundamental.

BACKGROUND OF THE TERM "SON OF GOD"

The phrase "Son of God" goes back to the language of Psalm 2:7 ("You are my son, today I have begotten you"), and owes its primary application to the Hebrew habit of representing any close relation, depending on choice or similarity of character, in terms of "sonship." In Psalm 2 these words are addressed to the theocratic king on the day of his coronation when he ascends the throne. The emphasis is threefold: (1) the king's unique relationship to God; (2) his ultimate world-wide authority; and (3) his complete ascendancy in power, if any should stand against him. From henceforth he is Yahweh's representative and "son." When the words were addressed to Jesus at His baptism, they conveyed the divine recognition of His vocation as the Messianic representative of God. The title has Messianic significance in that it embodies the idea that the office involves divine choice, the divine commission, and complete harmony between the bearer of it and God.⁴ Thus the phrase had special significance as emphasizing the personal relationship between God and His repre-

⁴"Son of God" is closely related to, or practically interchangeable with "Christ" as is seen on comparing Matt. 27:40 ("... save yourself! If you are the Son of God, come down from the cross") and Luke 23:35 ("... let him save himself, if he is the Christ of God, his Chosen One!"). This is also seen in Acts when the author says that Paul proclaimed Jesus, saying, "He is the Son of God" (9:20), and two verses later where he says that Paul continued to prove that "Jesus was the Christ."

sentative, and so opening an avenue of connection between our Lord's filial consciousness and His sense of Messianic vocation.

No doubt the psalmists and prophets had prepared the way for Paul's understanding of Christ as the Son of God. Then too, Jesus' own filial consciousness as represented by the Synoptics is an important factor in the Apostle's usage.⁵ Paul thinks of the Son of God not in a sense akin to the pagan mythological idea of the gods who were capable in an anthropomorphic sense of begetting offspring, but in the sense that the Christ was the Father's Beloved ($\chi\lambda\pi\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$) who stood in a unique relation to the Father, the object of His peculiar solicitude and care.⁶ It is thus that God comes to be for Paul in a special sense "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ"⁷ and that the Lord Jesus can be described, in relation to God, as His "own Son"⁸ or as His "Beloved Son."⁹

⁵J. S. Stewart, A Man In Christ, p. 303.

⁶Cf. J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, II, p. 477, who says: "we must not weaken the meaning of the words and say that 'Son' is here only a figurative representation of the love of God for Christ. Certainly this special love for Him is strongly emphasized, but it belongs to Him just because He is the Son, not the reverse. . . . When Paul unhesitatingly makes use of the term [Son of God], this is possible only because its mythological character has already been wholly stripped away by him. One learns this from the fact that he either gives no thought at all . . . as to the manner of the coming into existence of this Son of God. He does not brood over his origin; of the 'begetting' he says nothing at all. . . . This Son of God is already in existence, and is from the beginning present with God."

⁷Rom. 15:6; II Cor. 1:3; 11:31.

⁸Rom. 8:3,32; cf. Gal. 4:4; II Cor. 1:19.

⁹Cf. Col. 1:13.

THE RESURRECTION AND CHRIST'S SONSHIP

In his kerygmatic formula Paul states that Christ was "designated" (RSV) Son of God. There are two possible meanings of this much-discussed word *ὁρισθέντος* : (1) "separated," "marked off by boundaries," or (2) "determined," "appointed," "declared," or "designated." As the immediate context does not decide in which sense the word is used we must look to the wider context of Paul's understanding of the term "Son of God."

Sonship Eternal

It is certain that the Apostle did not believe that Christ became the Son of God solely by the resurrection, but that His Sonship was vindicated and revealed by His resurrection.¹⁰ When in Romans 8:3 (also Gal. 4:4) Paul says that God sent His Son this assertion unquestionably presupposes that the Son already existed, and was with God before He came into the world.¹¹ He was the Son of God from the beginning--but in weakness and lowliness during His earthly ministry. To be sure, the potential-

¹⁰Cf. Charles B. Williams' translation: "... proved to be God's Son in power by the resurrection from the dead," The New Testament (Chicago: Moody Press, 1953). James Moffatt, The New Testament, new ed. rev. (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1935), translated *ὁρισθέντος* as "installed" which suggests that at the resurrection Jesus assumed an office and relationship which He had not previously possessed. Lietzmann, An die Römer, p. 24, quotes Xenophon (Mem. IV. 6,4) as showing that *ὁρίζειν τινα τι* means to determine or define an individual as something. Lietzmann thinks, however, that the word here means to appoint to a position or office.

¹¹Cf. II Cor. 8:9; Phil. 2:6.

ity of Jesus' being designated Son of God (as with Messiah) by His resurrection lies in what He was already, but the emphasis in Romans 1:4 undoubtedly falls on what Christ has become through His resurrection.¹²

From the sole understanding of Romans 1:4 the adoptionist interpretation is certainly not impossible, but it would be inconsistent with the rest of the statements of the Apostle, both in his earlier and his later writings. Not only the Epistles to the Philippians and to the Colossians, but even the First Epistle to the Corinthians contain statements about the eternal Son of God (I Cor. 8:6) which cannot be reconciled with any adop-

¹²Cf. Neill Q. Hamilton, The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul, pp. 14 f. It is noteworthy that in a discussion of the significance of ὁπίσθ' ἑντος, John Knox, while agreeing with some commentators (i. e. J. Weiss) that there did exist a "primitive adoptionism" as represented by Acts 2:36, at the same time does not believe that Paul's statement here in Rom. 1:4 is to be equated with the "adoptionism" of Acts because of Paul's statements elsewhere regarding Christ's pre-existence. He believes that there was an intermediate stage between the early adoptionist views and the later views of incarnationism as found in the Fourth Gospel (1:14), and that Paul wrote his letter to the Romans during this intermediate period. He states: "At this stage the pre-existence of Christ is affirmed, but the older 'adoptionist' pattern, with its sharp contrast between the humble human life and the final glorious exaltation remains largely intact. . . . Since Paul's Christology is of the intermediate type and therefore not as coherent and consistent as either the primitive adoptionism which preceded it or the incarnationism which followed, it is likely that both meanings of the term (ὁπίσθ' ἑντος) apply: Jesus had been God's Son before the earthly life began and the resurrection was a 'declaration' of that fact; but the pre-existent Son of God had 'emptied himself' (Phil. 2:7) to become in very fact a humble man, and the resurrection thus meant a real change, a change in fact as well as in formal or merely outward status" (see "The Epistle to the Romans," I.B., IX, pp. 382 f.). Cf. also John Knox, Christ The Lord, pp. 86-96, where he expresses the same thoughts. While this interpretation is interesting, it cannot be conclusive because we have no definite knowledge of such an "intermediate state," on which point Knox's theory depends.

tionist view of this kind, and certainly not the form of adoptionism of the second century. Nor is it at all likely that Paul here is going contrary to his earliest views and expressing himself in adoptionist terms so as not to offend any possible adherents of an "adoptionist Christology" which may have existed in the Church at Rome.¹³

Jesus was the Son of God before He entered the world, but while this is true, it is not the most important truth. We empty Paul's argument here in Romans 1:4 (and in Phil. 2:5-11) of its distinctive significance if we assume that Christ's exaltation at His resurrection was merely a return to His pre-existent state.¹⁴ After Jesus' resurrection the inherent glory of His Sonship was then manifested, and He took over the full power that was in keeping with His Sonship. Christ's resurrection gave Him something new.¹⁵ It was not a case of exaltation of humanity to divinity; rather His resurrection displayed Him as being what He was inalienably from the first, and installed Him in the dignity which corresponded with His nature. At His baptism the Holy Spirit had descended on Jesus and He was proclaimed

¹³Cf. Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History (V. 28), where he mentions the claim of the Roman Adoptionists that their theory was the original teaching of Christianity, and that down to the time of Pope Victor (A.D. 190-198)--by whom the Adoptionist leader Theodotus of Byzantium was excommunicated--it had been the accepted teaching of Christianity at Rome.

¹⁴Cf. Otto Pfleiderer, Paulinism, I, p. 159.

¹⁵Karl H. Rengstorff, Die Auferstehung Jesu, p. 71. W. D. Davies (Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 296) says: "The Resurrection had designated Christ the Son of God and from that moment the Kingdom of the Son was 'actualized.'"

the Beloved Son. Then began His Messianic mission which issued in death, but as the Risen Son of God He exercised the fulness of the Messianic function.¹⁶

Son in Power after the Resurrection

From the resurrection hour He was the Son of God in a new sense: He was the Son "in power." (But it must be pointed out that this heightened glory which He attained through His resurrection is a glory pertaining to His acknowledged dignity or status, not to His essential nature or personality.) He now has power over that which formerly had power over Him. Before this the whole race was under the sway of death; but in the resurrection of Christ life burst forth victoriously, and a new aeon began --the aeon of the resurrection and life. In this new age Christ has the power to impart His Sonship to others, to make all men, who will receive His Spirit, sons of God (cf. Rom. 8:23, 28). "In power" means that only after the resurrection did the disciples comprehend His full reality, the revelation of that which had previously been hidden under His bodily form. This particular addition, "in power," distinguishes and presupposes an earlier existence and presence of the Son which was not the same as the latter, but which was, nevertheless, already existing; otherwise the addition of the distinguishing phrase would be meaningless.¹⁷

¹⁶Cf. Reginald H. Fuller, The Mission and Achievement of Jesus (London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1954), pp. 83 ff.; E. G. Selwyn, "The Authority of Christ in the New Testament," N.T.S., II, No. 2 (Jan., 1957), p. 87.

¹⁷Cf. Christ's use of the same terminology (ἐν δυνάμει) in

The expression "in power" has been taken by most commentators as descriptive of the Son, thus contrasting the weakness and humiliation of Jesus' earlier life with His present post-resurrection status.¹⁸ Other investigators think it to be used adverbially, qualifying ἐπιθεῖντος -- "designated in power to be the Son of God."¹⁹ Even though the latter suggestion is not grammatically impossible, the word order seems to be against this interpretation. Had the Apostle meant the words "with power" to be understood adverbially it seems that he would have placed ἐν δυνάμει between τοῦ and ἐπιθεῖντος; as it is, ἐν δυνάμει follows the words "Son of God." As Hamilton suggests, ἐπιθεῖντος is forceful enough in itself to complete its meaning without adverbs; to connect "in power" with "designate" would be redundant.²⁰ The simpler rendering and the one that fulfils all requirements is to read, "the Son of God in power." In any case, as far as our interests are concerned it is a minor point and either interpretation serves to magnify the Son of God in connection with the resurrection.

His message of the Kingdom of God: "... before they see the kingdom of God come with power" (Mark 9:1).

¹⁸John Knox, "The Epistle to the Romans," *op. cit.*, p. 383; cf. A. Nygren, *Commentary on Romans*, p. 48; Hamilton, *op. cit.*, pp. 12 f. C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1957), p. 18, note 1, makes this suggestion: "It seems best to stop at this point ['appointed Son of God'], allowing 'in power' and 'after his resurrection from the dead' to be Pauline supplement to an earlier formula."

¹⁹Sanday and Headlam, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 9; V. Taylor, *The Epistle to the Romans* (London: Epworth Press, 1955), p. 20.

²⁰*Op. cit.*, p. 13, note 1.

According to the Spirit of Holiness

The Apostle Paul says that Jesus was designated Son of God "according to the Spirit of holiness" by His resurrection from the dead. This is a most difficult phrase to understand and no proposed explanation of its meaning is altogether satisfying. Some interpreters think that the Apostle is here thinking of the striking declaration of the divine Sonship of Christ contained in the work wrought by the Holy Spirit since the resurrection.²¹ Other scholars think that Paul's thought here is a contrast between Jesus' human nature and His divine nature which had been hidden in fleshly covering but which was now made manifest in the resurrection.²² In view of this latter interpretation Nygren thinks that when the Apostle says that Christ "was descended from David according to the flesh" he means that as a man Jesus belonged to the line of David; He was an historical person, common humanity, belonging to the existing age. And when he says that Christ is designated Son of God "according to the Spirit

²¹Cf. O. Cullmann, Christ and Time, p. 236; Wilfred L. Knox, "The 'Divine Hero' Christology in the New Testament," H.T.R., XLI, No. 4 (Oct., 1948), p. 231; Patrick Canon Boylan, St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son, Ltd., 1934), p. 5; Sydney Cave, The Gospel of St. Paul (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1928), p. 73; J. Moffatt, An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, 3rd ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1918), p. 522; Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics, Vol. I, Part 2: The Doctrine of the Word of God, trans. by G. T. Thomson and Harold Knight (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956), p. 199. Lietzmann, loc. cit., thinks of the Spirit of holiness as the Holy Spirit and as a rhetorical device to make the contrast sharper.

²²By spelling "Spirit" with a capital the RSV translators show that they favour the view that the contrast is between Jesus' human nature, flesh and spirit on the one hand, and on the other the divine nature, conferred through, perhaps identical with, the Holy Spirit manifest in the

of holiness by his resurrection from the dead," Paul means that in conformity with Jesus' divine nature He entered into sovereign power in the new aeon, through and beginning with, His resurrection.²³ While this latter view is to be preferred, it is doubtful that we can say that Paul thought in terms of two "natures" of Jesus; certainly he has not so formulated his thoughts in the epistles.

By the Resurrection of the Dead

In his statement that Jesus was designated Son of God "by the resurrection of the dead" (ἐξ ἀνστάντων νεκρῶν) it is noticeable that there is no article before either "resurrection" or "dead."²⁴ We would have expected the writer to have said, "by His resurrection from the dead," as found in the Revised Standard Version, but the explanation probably lies in the fact that for the Apostle the resurrection of Christ and the resurrection of the dead are not two totally different things, but basically one and the same truth. Paul elsewhere speaks of Christ as the first-born from the dead (Col. 1:18), and thus he can

resurrection. See J. Knox, "The Epistle to the Romans," op. cit., pp. 383 f. Cf. R. Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, p. 242, who says: "This nature [Christ's holy spiritual nature] entered at death into a condition of death, and a resuscitation was necessary for it to live again. But such resuscitation had to do not with his fleshly body, but with the holy spiritual nature which was hidden in Christ."

²³Commentary on Romans, pp. 52 ff. Cf. Hamilton, op. cit., p. 13; Anton Fridrichsen, "The Apostle and his Message," op. cit., p. 10.

²⁴When the article is used τῶν νεκρῶν would suggest "dead bodies," but without the article, simply "dead" (death).

speak of Jesus' rising from a "resurrection of the dead" ($\nu\epsilon\kappa\rho\acute{\omega}\nu$, plural) because in Him the general hope of mankind received a first fulfilment. The age of the resurrection was thus begun, and as Paul's argument in I Corinthians 15 states, that which happened to the Head will also happen to the body. As yet it is limited to the Head, but it is none the less true and meaningful for all who are members of His body.

CONCLUSION

As we have seen, the Apostle Paul here in Romans 1:4 proclaims Christ's Sonship in connection with the resurrection. While Christ's Sonship is eternal He nevertheless became Son "in power" at the resurrection when the inherent glory of His Sonship was manifested so that He could exercise the fulness of the Messiahship. God's signal manifestation of divine power in raising His Son from the dead was a testimony to the truth of Him who claimed to be the Son of God. Although the Sonship of Jesus had been proclaimed by the whole of His ministry (His teaching, miracles, character, and language), few had been able to recognize Him as such, but now the conscience of the whole of mankind was laid under formal obligation to acknowledge it.

IV: THE LAST ADAM

As pointed out by W. D. Davies,¹ a marked feature of Judaism in the centuries preceding the Christian era was the growth of speculation about the first man, Adam, and his fall. Paul would naturally have been familiar with this vast amount of speculation within Judaism about the first man, and in his thinking of the Risen Jesus, who was now reigning as Messiah and Lord, he was led to contrast Him with the first Adam. He applied the names "the Last Adam" and "the Second Man" to Christ in I Corinthians 15:45-49 (cf. I Cor. 15:20-22), and afterwards the idea is expanded in Romans 5:12-21. In both of these passages the Apostle makes use of this analogy, in both cases assuming its validity, not trying to prove it.

CHRIST/ADAM PARALLEL IN I CORINTHIANS 15:45-49

Paul sets up Adam and Christ in this parallel, not to affirm their identity, but on the contrary to point out the contrast between them. In I Corinthians 15 we see the following relationship:

verse 45--the first Adam . . . the last Adam
 a living being . . . a life-giving spirit
 verse 47--the first man. . . . the second man
 verse 47 f.--from earth. . . . from heaven.

¹Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 44 ff.

Contrast between Christ and Adam

In their context verses 45 ff. throw light not directly upon Paul's conception of Christ, but upon his concept of the new life of the resurrection, and of the means by which God brings it about (cf. Rom. 8: 11). The Risen and Exalted Christ is a greater glory than Adam in the garden of Eden--even before Adam had sinned and brought upon himself condemnation.² Christ was not the mere second edition of the first Adam in His unfallen state; He was a new creation, unique. Christ was to undo the evils of the fall and was indeed the counterpart of the first Adam. But the Last Adam not only repairs the fault of the first, but He brings about actual progress and marks out a higher order of life. Thus N. A. Dahl is led to say:

The superiority of the 'image of Christ' over that of Adam marks the superiority of resurrection over creation. It is quite clear that Christ as the 'last Adam' is here thought to bring something more than what was lost through the Fall.³

Christ is the Last Adam who finally crushes the serpent's head (Gen. 3:15). In Him the first Adam and all his posterity are healed; the evil effects of their disobedience are destroyed, and man recovers the holiness which was his at the beginning. Christ makes it possible for man to receive again what he had lost in Adam, that is, the image and likeness of God.

² Cf. Luke 11:31 which speaks of Christ's glory as even greater than that of Solomon.

³ "Christ, Creation and the Church," in B.N.T.I.E., p. 435.

Thus the resurrection of Christ completes the creation of humanity; it is a creative event within creation.

In Paul's thought all men were in Adam (I Cor. 15:22), through whom sin had entered into the race and produced rebellion against God's plan.⁴ The first Adam was representative man, and behind this idea we may see the consciousness of human solidarity which was so fundamental to Old Testament thought. This Adam who had sinned brought condemnation and death upon his descendents according to the flesh,⁵ but the Last Adam brought the reversal--the gift of life for those who belong to Him by faith. While Adam committed one sin, which incurred the penalty of death for him and all his posterity, the resurrection of Christ atoned not merely for that one sin of Adam, but for the sins of all men.⁶

The "mind" of the first Adam was the mind of self-deification; the mind of the Last Adam was the mind of humility and lowliness. As Adam was tempted, so was Christ. The first Adam had succumbed to the temptation; the Last Adam, as the climax of His lowliness and of His submission to the will of God, was willing even to die, and for that reason--precisely on the ground of His submission to death--God exalted Him even to the point

⁴The sin of Eve is not considered because Paul is contrasting race-representative with race-representative. Elsewhere (cf. II Cor. 11:3; I Tim. 2:14) it is hinted that sin had entered earlier into the world.

⁵Paul's primary emphasis is not how the sin of Adam could affect his descendents but the fact that all men are bound in a unity with Adam, and that like Adam all men have sinned and come short of the glory which God gave them at the time of creation.

⁶Cf. Acts 5:31 where the resurrection and exaltation of Christ is related to the forgiveness of sins.

of bestowing upon Him "the name which is above every name." He had defeated sin and offered the race the opportunity of a fresh start. Those who formerly belonged to Adam, the defeated, may now belong to Christ the victorious.⁷

At his entrance into the visible world, the primogenitor, Adam, was made a "living being" (I Cor. 15:45); the Last Adam, at His entrance into the invisible world, was made a "life-giving spirit," or as Professor Matthew Black has said, an "immortalising spirit."⁸ He has become a life-giving spirit for all, a spiritual power which is able to communicate to all and imprint on all His glory. This marks the crisis of man's redemption whereby he becomes a "new creation" and henceforth "walks in newness of life" (Rom. 6:4). This new life is the power which looses man from his bonds, and brings him back to God.

"The first man was from the earth, a man of dust; the second man is from heaven" (I Cor. 15:47).⁹ This verse describes the natures of Adam and of Christ, but also that of all who follow after them. Thus those

⁷The relation of the Last Adam to temptation is brought out by the Pauline associate, Luke, who perhaps reveals a knowledge of the Christ/Adam typology when he reckons the genealogy of Jesus from Adam (Luke 3:38), and then immediately follows it with the account of the temptation (4:1 ff). Cf. J. Jeremias, "Aδλφ", *T.W.N.T.*, I, pp. 141 ff., for further indications of the Christ/Adam typology in this Lucan passage.

⁸"The Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam," *S.J.T.*, VII, No. 2 (June, 1954), p. 171.

⁹The best reading in vs. 47 omits ὁ κύριος (A.V.) after ὁ δεύτερος ἀνθρώπος, which is no doubt a scribal interpolation. The idea is that "the Second Man is the Lord from heaven" (A.V.), which is certainly Paul's meaning.

who are Christ's become thereby of heaven, and heavenly, in the same sense in which these words apply to Christ. The body of the first Adam had been a body "of humiliation," and as composed of flesh and blood could not inherit the Kingdom of God. The body of the Last Adam after the resurrection was a spiritual or heavenly body. Until the resurrection of Christ the highest thing that could be said of man was that he was a "living being," and even that was qualified by the fact that he was made of the dust of the earth. In teaching that Adam was "natural," while Christ is "spiritual," Paul does not mean to imply that Adam had no spiritual nature. The two are contrasted only in a single particular: Adam is the natural head of the race, Christ the spiritual.

The New Age

That a new age had begun with Christ was derived from the certainty of Paul's own experience. His encounter with the Risen Christ on the road to Damascus led to a tremendous deliverance and transformation of his life. It meant redemption--deliverance from the guilt of sin, from the bondage of the Law, and from the dominion of unseen demonic forces of evil. But not only had Christ broken for him the rule of evil, but his liberation had a positive content in that the Risen Lord supplied him with new power. Paul's epistles are full of antitheses setting forth the differences that Christ has made. He refers to his "old self" which was crucified with Christ (Rom. 6:6); to the new nature put on through Christ (Col. 3:10); to slavery as having given place to liberty (Gal. 4:3, 9; 5:1); and to life in the flesh in contrast to life in the spirit (Rom. 8). Thus his con-

version experience had meant deliverance from the present evil age into the new age, and this experience he described as a new creation (ΚΛΙΨΗ ΚΤΙΣΙΣ) in which all things have become new.¹⁰ Once the Apostle had become convinced that Jesus was the Messiah, it was natural that he should have assigned to Him universal and cosmic functions, and regarded the Christian dispensation as a new creation. In view of this, the transition to the thought of Christ as the Last Adam was a most natural one.¹¹ This view further expresses the Christological significance of the resurrection for Paul.

Christ stands by reason of His resurrection as the author and perfecter of the new aeon (ὁ ἀρχὴν ὁ νέων). In the old aeon, which began with Adam, death ruled with unlimited power over all the children of Adam, but now in the new aeon life has come to dominion still more mightily. Christ brings about the destruction of the ruling powers which are controlling the present age. Thus Paul's contrast between Adam and Christ is really a contrast between two different orders of existence;

¹⁰Cullmann points out that the reckoning of time backwards from the birth of Christ only became established in the eighteenth century. Up until then the reckoning of time B. C. was not oriented to the birth of Christ, but the years continued to be dated on the basis of older calendars of the world eras from the creation. See Cullmann, Christ and Time, pp. 17 ff.

¹¹Cf. W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 36 f., who suggests that Paul had tried to use the motif of the "Kingdom of God" in his Thessalonian preaching but it had been misunderstood. Thus he tells them of the new age and the new creation--ideas with which they were familiar.

one under the dominion of death and the other under the dominion of life.

The New Humanity

If "in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive" (I Cor. 15:22). This life-giving power belongs to Him who rose from the dead, and who is now in possession of a humanity that has been redeemed in its entirety from sin and death, and transfigured in all its parts. At the resurrection Christ became a life-giving spirit to mankind, and by the heightening of His powers that there took place, He was so made one with the very life of God as to be constituted a perfect medium through whom the Spirit of God could act upon us.¹²

Having Genesis 2:7 in mind the Apostle says, "the first man Adam became a living being," and he adds, "the last Adam became a life-giving spirit."¹³ This second clause (vs. 45b) is not in Genesis 2:7 and is of undetermined origin. It is probably Paul's comment upon verse 45a, or as

¹²Closely tied-up with the concept of the Last Adam as a life-giving Spirit is the fact that the Exalted Christ is thought of as the medium by whom the Holy Spirit is given. Also, as Adam was the first-born of mankind, so Christ is the first-born (πρωτότοκος) among many brethren (Rom. 8:29), or the first-fruit of those who have fallen asleep (I Cor. 15:20,23; cf. Col. 1:18). What is true of Him is true of all who are connected with Him. Therefore, since He arose from the dead all shall rise with Him. We shall discuss these ideas below.

¹³Here in I Cor. 15:45 the prerogative of life-giving belongs to Christ; in 15:22 He is the sphere in which it is to be exercised. In Rom. 8:11 the word ζωοποιῶν describes the Father's prerogative of raising the dead through the agency of the indwelling Spirit (whichever reading is adopted in the last line). Cf. Rom. 4:17. In II Cor. 3:6 the Spirit is spoken of as giving life. The same word is used in John's Gospel to describe the prerogative of the Father and the Son (5:21), and also of the Spirit--following a reference to the Ascension (John 6:62,63).

Dahl has said, it is Paul's "eschatological application according to the principle of analogy (typology), often combined with the idea of the superiority of the new creation."¹⁴ The thought of the Risen Christ prompts such a comparison and it was not until the resurrection and exaltation that it could be said that Christ became a life-giving spirit (vide infra). As Adam was the head and representative of the first humanity,¹⁵ so the Last Adam implies the conception of Christ as the Head of the new humanity--a corporate unity of redeemed men.¹⁶ Kunneth states:

¹⁴Op. cit., p. 429. C. F. Burney, The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922), pp. 45 ff., maintained that Paul's use of "and thus it is written" refers "not simply to the quotation from Gen. 2:7, 'He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul,' but to the whole passage relating to the first Adam and the second Adam, from ἐγένετο down to ζωοποιού." Thus Burney thinks that the phrase "the last Adam became a life-giving spirit" should be divided from the preceding clause merely by a comma, and not by a colon as in the RSV. However, see W. D. Davies, op. cit., pp. 43 f., who does not agree with Burney that the whole of vs. 45 is a quotation. Vide infra the discussion of Paul's originality in regard to this concept.

¹⁵It is impossible to say with certainty whether Paul looked upon Adam as an historical person. See E. Andrews, The Meaning of Christ For Paul, p. 95, who thinks that it is probable that Paul did. He states: "At any rate he recognized a corporate wrongness as belonging to humanity and traced it to an act of sin by one who represents humanity on the natural plane."

¹⁶Cf. Acts 5:30 f. Peter, speaking for the apostles before the council, declared: "The God of our fathers raised Jesus whom you killed by hanging him on a tree. God exalted him at his right hand as Leader [ἡγούμενος] and Savior . . ." Cf. Acts 3:15; Heb. 2:10; 12:2. ἡγούμενος signifies one who takes a lead in, or provides the first occasion of, anything. Jesus is the One who is the source of faith, deliverance, and life, and is at the same time the path-breaker who has opened the way for others--thus giving cohesion and leadership to His community. Hence the resurrection and exaltation declared Jesus as the Founder and Leader of the primitive community. See W. E. Vine, An Expositi-

Christus als der zweite Adam ist kein "Übermensch", sondern der wahrhaftige Mensch, der in der Entscheidung ohne Sünde bleibt und darum Träger der endgültigen Schöpfung, Träger der Verheissung auf Auferstehung sein kann. Die kreatürliche Menschheit Jesu kann trotz Fall und Sünde wieder für alle Kreatur zur Weissagung auf Erfüllung der Schöpfung werden, zum Hinweis auf die neue Möglichkeit einer Rettung aus der Hoffnungslosigkeit zur Hoffnung einer neuen Schöpfungsexistenz.¹⁷

Jesus as the Head of this new humanity was the divine goal towards which the whole history of the people of Israel had been leading-up, and a fresh starting-point for the history of both Jews and Gentiles. This new humanity is to be thought of as the church, the people of God.¹⁸ It is a new humanity where distinctions of race, colour, culture, and class are to be done away, for "Here there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave, freeman, but Christ is all, and in all" (Col. 3:11).

Now as there were innumerable multitudes of men between the first man and Christ, it is evident that Jesus is called the "Second Man" for some special reason. These men between Adam and Christ do not count as such, for they are not men in the special sense in which the title anthropos is applied here. Jesus is the Second Man because He is the representative and father of all His spiritual seed, as the first man was of all his natural seed. He is Second Man, not because He was the second

tory Dictionary of New Testament Words (London: Oliphants Ltd., 1939), I, p. 88; and V. Taylor, The Names of Jesus, p. 91.

¹⁷Op. cit., Vierte Auflage (1951), p. 149.

¹⁸See E. Andrews, op. cit., pp. 103-105.

public head as Adam was the first. Through Christ God has constituted the true Israel, a corporate humanity in the midst of history, in which there is freedom from sin and peace with God. This new spiritual humanity will be fully in existence only after the present age, already dying, has come to an end; but it already exists in principle, in the church, the fellowship of believers, upon whom the Spirit has come as a pledge of their inheritance.

As Adam's death meant death for all his aeon, the age of death, so Christ's resurrection meant resurrection and thus life for all those who through Him have become members of the new aeon, the age of life (cf. Col. 1:13). As Nygren points out, Paul meant by "death" more than the mere termination of this life.

What Paul had to say to the effect that sin came into the world through Adam, and death through sin, has often been interpreted as if he, with theoretical interest looked into the past for an explanation of the phenomenon that man must die, after he has lived for a longer or shorter time. But this is certainly to misunderstand his words. What he is saying is rather that all that we call life, with all that it encompasses, lies under the dominion of death. He finds that all humanity's life, from Adam till now, is lived under the mark and condition of death. Death rules supreme in this world--and it is to miss the point to ask whether this means physical, spiritual, or eternal death. Death is the status of all who belong to this world, the children of Adam.¹⁹

Relation of the Expressions "Last Adam" and "Second Adam"

Paul says the "Last Adam" rather than the "second Adam" because

¹⁹Commentary on Romans, p. 22. Cf. also Professor G. Florovsky, "The Lamb of God," S.J.T., IV (1951), pp. 27 f.

here the point is that Christ is the final and supreme result in the ascending development. There will be no other Head of the human race. Werner Meyer offers the further suggestion that Christ is the Last Adam and not just the second Adam because He comes into the world in the "last time" and brings about the end of the present world order.

"Letzter ADAM," und nicht einfach "zweiter ADAM," sagt Paulus schliesslich deshalb, weil der in Christus anhebende Geistesmensch das Ende der jetzigen Weltordnung bedeutet. Seit Jesus Christus kam, ist "letzte Zeit." Im Masse als der neue ADAM, Christus und seine Gemeinde, in Erscheinung tritt, vergeht diese Welt. "Es vergehe diese Welt, und es komme die Gnade" (Zwölfapostellehre).²⁰

While most commentators²¹ in speaking of the Last Adam consistently use the term "the Second Adam," it is noteworthy that only the designations "Last Adam" (ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ) and "Second Man" (δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος) appear in I Corinthians 15. The appellation "Second Adam" cannot be found in these exact words in the epistles. However, this is not to imply that the usage of the phrase "Second Adam" is not within Pauline thought. It is most reasonable that Paul's Hebrew mind would have thought of Adam also in terms of the Greek ἄνθρωπος, since the Hebrew אָדָם basically means "man." Hence on this basis the term "Second Adam" can be employed legitimately. C. A. Wood, who in his unpublished thesis has presented the Second Adam as the key to Paul's conception of the humanity of Jesus Christ,²² chooses to use the

²⁰Der erste Brief an die Korinther (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1945), II, p. 297.

²¹D. Somerville, S. Nowell Rostron, W. D. Davies, Matthew Black, etc.

²²St. Paul's Conception of the Humanity of Jesus Christ (The

term "Second Adam" in preference to "Last Adam." He gives the following as the reason for his choice:

SL
The term "Last Adam" calls to mind an eschatological significance, and the term "Second Adam" indicates an historical significance. Admittedly, this inclines toward an artificial distinction, yet it enable one to see that the Apostle thought in historical terms about the New Adam as well as eschatologically, in pre-resurrection as well as in post-resurrection terms.²³

While the Last Adam and the Second Man are related to the Exalted Christ as an eschatological event entering history, the terms are to be associated as well with the historical Christ, as C. A. Wood has suggested above. Paul has in mind the historical Jesus of human history who conquered death and who is now in His glorified, risen being. If the parallels which he draws between Christ and Adam are to have significance and meaning then the designation "Last Adam," while used in a post-resurrection context, must at the same time imply real human lives to both Christ as well as Adam, and express the reality of their humanity, their temptation, and their need of choice.²⁴

The Head of the new race Himself became a life-giving spirit, had a body of glory, belonged to heaven and the spiritual world, and provided for those who through Him were joined to the new humanity a guarantee that a like heavenly body would be theirs. This Last Adam was not simply

University of Edinburgh, 1954).

²³Ibid., p. 53.

²⁴Cf. A. H. McNeile, New Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's (Cambridge: University Press, 1923), p. 74.

a soul that possessed life; He was the One who gave life through the Spirit which He bestowed (cf. John 20:22). Thus those who had borne the image of the earthly would now bear the image of the heavenly.

CHRIST/ADAM PARALLEL IN ROMANS 5:12-21 AND ELSEWHERE

As we have seen in I Corinthians 15 Paul compared Christ and Adam in regard to their natures, in regard to the relation in which they stand to their humanities. In Romans 5:12-21²⁵ he compares their influence in their historical effect, and though the terms Last Adam and Second Man do not appear, the contrast between Adam and Christ makes it obvious that the same concept of the Last Adam is running through the Apostle's mind. The chief difference between the two passages is the fact that while the Corinthians passage deals with the person of Jesus Christ and the resurrection body, the Romans passage deals with the work of Christ and the doctrine of redemption.

The first Adam was a figure or type (τύπος) of Him that was to come (Rom. 5:14), and when the first Adam is called τύπος τοῦ μελλόντος we should probably understand ὁ ἄδμ with τοῦ μελλόντος -- "who is the type of the future Adam."²⁶ There are

²⁵A. Nygren, Commentary on Romans, p. 20, thinks of Rom. 5:12-21 as "the high point of the epistle, in the light of which the whole is best to be understood."

²⁶Cf. E. Earle Ellis, "Typology," Paul's Use of the Old Testament (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957), pp. 126 ff.

several important antitheses which appear in verses 15-21. In verse 15 Paul deals with the differences involved between the deeds of Adam and those of Christ. The $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\pi\tau\omega\mu\alpha$ of Adam is set over against the $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\tau\omega\mu\alpha$ of Christ: there is greater efficacy in the redemptive work of Christ ($\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\tau\omega\mu\alpha$) for good than in Adam's transgression ($\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\pi\tau\omega\mu\alpha$) for evil. The phrase $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\ \mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu$ seems to emphasize the greater certainty and permanence of the effect of Christ's work, as well as its super-abundance. In verse 16 we have contrasted the $\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha$, which leads to the $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\iota\mu\alpha$, with the $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\tau\omega\mu\alpha$, which leads to $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\mu\alpha$. Further, the reign of death, established by Adam's sin, is differentiated from the reign of life in the lives of those who have received the gift of righteousness (vs. 17). In verse 18 the sinful deed of an individual, which brings condemnation, is contrasted with the just deed of an individual, which brings justification. The disobedience, which makes men sinners, is in opposition to the obedience which makes men just (vs. 19). Finally, in verses 20-21 we have, on the one hand, sin ruling over men by death; and on the other, we have grace reigning through justice and preparing men for eternal life.²⁷

Although I Corinthians 15:45-49 and Romans 5:12-21 are the loci classici for the Pauline doctrine of the Last Adam, they are not the only

²⁷Cf. Patrick Canon Boylan, St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son, Ltd., 1934), p. 95.

occasions where the concept influenced the Apostle's expression. In Philippians 2:5 ff., for example, there is an apparent underlying contrast between the first and Last Adam. The first Adam strived to be as God and was disobedient to the specific command of the Lord (Gen. 3:3, 5); the Last Adam submitted Himself even to death in humble and obedient service to the will of God. The result was expulsion for the one (Gen. 3:24) and exaltation for the other (Phil. 2:9-11).²⁸ There also is evident the Christ/Adam typology in that the Last Adam bears the original image of God, the image that was marred by the first Adam but restored in the New Adam. This truth is revealed in II Corinthians 4:4-6 where Paul writes of the "glory of Christ, who is the likeness [$\epsilon\iota\kappa\omega\nu$] of God." These verses are in accord with the rabbinic belief that the glory with which Adam was endowed at creation departed from him at his fall. Here then, Paul is proclaiming that the divine glory and image are perfectly revealed and restored in Christ, and for him this is comparable in magnitude only to the first creation. Furthermore, the restored glory and image is related by Paul to the "new man" ($\tau\omicron\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\nu\omicron\nu\ \xi\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\nu$ --Eph. 4:24), the "new nature" ($\tau\omicron\nu\ \nu\epsilon\omicron\nu$ --Col. 3:10), and the "new creation"

²⁸ A considerable number of scholars have associated Phil. 2:5 ff. with a comparison and contrast between the first and Last Adam. A partial list of such interpreters would include: L. Ernesti, "Philipp. II, 6 ff. (aus einer Anspielung auf Genes. II, III)," Theologische Studien und Kritiken, Heft 4 (1848), pp. 858-924; C. A. Briggs, The Messiah of the Apostles (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895), p. 180; A. E. J. Rawlinson, The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ, pp. 133 ff.; G. S. Duncan, Jesus, Son of Man, pp. 193 f.; A. M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, pp. 50 f.; Matthew Black, op. cit., p. 175.

(ΚΑΙ ὁ ΚΥΡΙΟΣ --II Cor. 5:17).²⁹

THE POST-RESURRECTION SIGNIFICANCE OF THE "LAST ADAM" CONCEPT

Like the title "Lord," this designation "Last Adam" has post-resurrection significance. The immediate context, to say nothing of the overall stress of the chapter, is sufficient to show that the primary reference to Jesus has not to do with how He came into the world at His incarnation, nor how He manifested Himself on earth in the whole of His personality, but in what was revealed at His resurrection.³⁰ As long as He was in the flesh this aspect of His Person was concealed from men. Because He belonged to a particular nation, appeared at a special period of the world's history, and held definite relations as an individual Man to certain other men, men did not perceive what was universal, essential, and of world-wide significance in His human nature and in the ideals that were embodied in His life. There was needed a change in the outward form of His Being, and that change came when, laying aside the flesh, He was raised and exalted, and entered into those universal relations to mankind that disclosed the higher and ideal truth of His Person. Belonging now to

²⁹Cf. Col. 1:15 ff.; M. Black, op. cit., pp. 174 f.

³⁰However, cf. T. C. Edwards, A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, pp. 443 f. and The God-Man (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1895), p. 42, where he connects the designation "Second Adam" with Paul's doctrine of the incarnation.

this sphere of the Spirit, Christ was loosed from those relations that are rooted in the flesh. Now all the peculiarities of His earthly life--whether of nationality, culture, social position, or sex--were seen to be only provisional and temporary, and were merged in the higher order of the Spirit and of those spiritual relations which bind together into one fellowship all who share the Humanity of Christ (cf. Gal. 3:28). The universalism of Paul's gospel is thus closely connected with the significance which he attaches to the Person of Christ as the Last Adam.³¹

The post-resurrection usage of Last Adam is related to the use of the word *ἐγένητο*. This verb, which is understood in I Corinthians 15:45b, must necessarily refer to the point of time at which the Lord's body was resurrected and glorified, as the *ἐγένητο* of the first clause relates to the point of time when Adam's animated body came into existence.³² As the latter was the creative act of God by which Adam became a living being, so the former was God's act of raising from the dead, by which Christ was endowed with a spiritual body and thereby placed in a position to become for humanity a life-giving spirit, the originator of the heavenly humanity.³³ The emphasis rests not on the initial act of

³¹Cf. D. Somerville, St. Paul's Conception of Christ, pp. 55 ff.

³²Cf. Neill Q. Hamilton, Op. cit., pp. 14 f.; Geerhardus Vos, "The Eschatological Aspect of the Pauline Conception of the Spirit," Biblical and Theological Studies, pp. 228 ff.

³³Cf. J. Weiss, Christ: The Beginning of Dogma, p. 73, who insists that *ἐγένητο* in both cases must be taken to refer to the same point of time, and cannot in the first instance be applied to the creation of Adam and in the second to the exaltation of Christ. "Consequently," he

the resurrection but on the resulting state. This understanding of verse 46 explains how it can be said that the "physical" man was the earlier, and the "spiritual" the later.

It is interesting to note that Paul does not go to Adam to see how he is connected with Christ, but rather begins with Christ to see how He is connected with Adam. For Christ who seems to come second really comes first, and Adam who seems to come first really comes second.³⁴ As the world was created through Christ, He was actually before Adam in time, and Adam was not the first Adam. Adam is subordinate to Christ, and not Christ to Adam. As Karl Barth has pointed out, it is because Christ has thus invaded the world of Adam and claimed it for Himself that Paul can find a connection between the two, a way that leads from Adam to Christ for himself and all believers.³⁵ By His death and resurrection Christ has challenged the right of sin and death to rule over Adam's world; He has invaded this world and made it His own. This close relation-

concludes, "the allusion in the second part must be to the creation of the last Adam." Cf. L. S. Thornton, The Common Life in the Body of Christ (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1941), p. 433, who says that the implication of vs. 45 is that "the last Adam became 'a life-giving spirit' at the beginning of his earthly existence. But he began to exercise the functions of life-giving spirit in their fulness only after the resurrection."

³⁴This thought has led Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics, Vol. IV, Part I: The Doctrine of Reconciliation, trans. by G. W. Bromiley (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956), pp. 512 f., to say: "This Pauline argument is usually called the parallel between Adam and Christ. But at the very least we ought to speak of the parallel between Christ and Adam."

³⁵Christ and Adam, trans. by T. A. Smail (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1956), pp. 17 ff.

ship between the two is established therefore, not by trying to find a way from Adam to Christ, but by seeing that Christ has found the only way to Adam by His cross. Since Christ has passed from His side into the world of Adam, Adam is now free to pass into the world of Christ. Christ has removed the barriers and opened the doors so that Adam can pass from sin to pardon--from death to life.³⁶

For Paul the Christian is rid of the fellowship with Adam which is the fellowship with death. No longer is he "in Adam" but "in Christ" (ἐν τῷ Ἀδᾶμ . . . ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ --I Cor. 15:22),³⁷ and he has the guarantee that death has been overcome; "Death is swallowed up in victory" (I Cor. 15:54). Those who believe in Christ as the Head of the new humanity are to be transformed and thus to be different in their nature from what they had been previously. Each race has the attributes of its Head. Thus Paul believed that as we have borne the image of the earthly man, Adam, so also we shall bear the image of the heavenly Christ, who Himself is the image of God.³⁸ Thus Christians were not just people who had faith in Christ, but they were people of a new human type. C. A. A. Scott believes that this is the reason which led the Christians, from the very beginning, to form themselves into a community. He states:

³⁶Ibid.

³⁷Vide infra for the "in Christ" conception and its resurrection significance.

³⁸Cr. I Cor. 15:49; II Cor. 4:4; Col. 1:15.

In the last resort it was nothing but the affinity by which people of the same race are drawn to each other. Beneath the unity in hopes and beliefs and activities there was a deeper unity which may be described as one of kind. The Christians were reborn; their natures had undergone a change, so that they now belonged to a new type of humanity. . . . The primitive church represented this new type of humanity which Jesus brought into being, and its rise and growth were inevitable, since it was involved in the primary intention of the Christian faith.³⁹

THE ORIGINALITY OF THE "LAST ADAM" CONCEPT

Many of the earlier interpreters⁴⁰ assumed that the description of Christ as the Last Adam was a common rabbinic title for the Messiah, but such an assumption rests on slender foundations. It is true that the phrase "the first Adam" was common at the time Paul's epistles were written, but it signified nothing more than Adam the first man in opposition to all later men. There is no evidence to show that the new name, the Last Adam, was ever applied to the expected Messiah by the Jews, or that Paul owed the expression to his rabbinical training.⁴¹ Nor are Paul's thoughts of Christ as the Last Adam to be equated with the Primal

³⁹Christianity According to St Paul, pp. 65 f.

⁴⁰Sanday and Headlam, The Epistle to the Romans, p. 136; Joseph A. Beet, A Commentary of St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1882), p. 294; S. Nowell Rostron, The Christology of St. Paul (London: Robert Scott, 1912), pp. 59 f.; cf. D. Somerville, op. cit., p. 51.

⁴¹Cf. Henry St. John Thackeray, The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1900), pp. 40 ff.; Strack and Billerbeck, op. cit., III, pp. 477 f.; J. Jeremias, "'Adam,'" op. cit., p. 142.

Man of Persian, Indian, or Hellenistic speculation, though these may have helped to provide an atmosphere for its use.⁴² While it cannot be denied that "the heavenly ideal man" of Jewish and Alexandrine philosophy has a certain relation or similarity to that of Paul's "Last Adam," at the same time it is practically certain that Paul did not depend on them for the use of the expression.⁴³ Nor does the early Christian community seem to be the likely source for Paul's expression. Therefore, the conclusion

⁴²As L. Goppelt has noted (Tynos. Die typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen, p. 162), any view which reduces the Adam typology to speculation over a mythological Urmensch misses the point of Paul's analysis: "Die Beziehung Adam-Christus ist für Paulus nicht Veranschaulichungsmittel oder Spekulation sondern Erleuchtung und Vergewisserung des Glaubens aus der Schrift, echte Typologie." (As cited by E. Earle Ellis, op. cit., pp. 129 f.) Cf. J. Weiss, Der erste Korintherbrief (Meyer, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament), 10th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1925), p. 375; M. Black, op. cit., pp. 171 f.; Ernest Best, One Body in Christ (London: S.P.C.K., 1950), p. 40; Albert Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, pp. 166 f.

E. W. Barnes, The Rise of Christianity (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1947), p. 239, refers to Paul's doctrine of two Adams as a "curious and fantastic fragment of theological speculation." He thinks the doctrine is so closely related to the gnostic movement of the early second century "that one is tempted to assign it to a period some forty or fifty years after Paul's death." In his criticism of Barnes' position, J. N. Sanders (op. cit., p. 135) rightly comments: "It is more likely that the early Gnostics derived their ideas from the Pauline Epistles."

⁴³J. M. Creed in his article on "The Heavenly Man," J.T.S., XXVI (1925), p. 134, argues that Paul's doctrine of Christ as the last Adam had nothing to do with the "heavenly man" speculations of either Apocalyptic or of Philonic philosophy. He says: "It is not impossible that St. Paul actually combats the Philonic doctrine in I Cor. xv, where he maintains that the natural man was prior to the spiritual man." Paul nowhere uses the expression "heavenly man" of Christ, but he speaks of "the heavenly One" (ὁ ἐπουράνιος), I Cor. 15:48. Cf. M. Black, op. cit., p. 171; E. Earle Ellis, op. cit., pp. 64 f.; J. S. Stewart, A Man In Christ, p. 48; E. Andrews, The Meaning of Christ for Paul, pp. 96 ff.

of Davies regarding the question of whether or not the concept of Second Adam was pre-Pauline seems sound, viz., that although the idea of Christ's advent as a new creation preceded Paul's expression, the Apostle himself probably introduced the specific idea that Christ was the Second Adam.⁴⁴

But while we can say that the "Last Adam" Christological expression is an original contribution by Paul we can at the same time see thoughts in the faith of the primitive community that are the likely possibility as to the source of the expression. Following the suggestion of a group of scholars today one can agree that the real source is to be found in the "Son of Man" expression recorded in Old Testament canonical and non-canonical writings, which were transformed by the unique usage of Jesus.⁴⁵ As Son of Man Jesus, identifying Himself with the Suffering

⁴⁴Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 41-44. In his appraisal of Phil. 2:6 f. Davies assumes agreement with A. E. J. Rawlinson (The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ, p. 134) and A. M. Hunter (Paul and His Predecessors, pp. 46-51) in thinking of the hymn as embodying the theme of the Second Adam in contrast to the first, but he does not believe there is sufficient evidence to show that this is a pre-Pauline tradition, as Professor Hunter believes. Davies also states that had the identification of Christ with the Second Adam been pre-Pauline it would have left its marks in the Synoptic Gospels--especially in the Temptation narratives where there would have been an obvious occasion for contrasting Christ and Adam. Nor does Davies agree with C. F. Burney (op. cit., pp. 43-48) in thinking that I Cor. 15:45 is a quotation from Old Testament Testimonia. Cf. E. Earle Ellis, op. cit., pp. 96 f.

⁴⁵E. g., Werner Meyer, loc. cit.; C. H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, p. 121; M. Black, op. cit., p. 170; W. Manson, Jesus, the Messiah, pp. 185-190; Gösta Lindeskog, "The Theology of Creation in the Old and New Testaments," The Root of the Vine, Anton Fridrichsen et al. (London: Dacre Press, 1953), pp. 16, 22; E. A. Abbott, op. cit., p. 5;

Servant of Isaiah, had affirmed on His part a real humanity and a condition of solidarity with mankind. Hence it is most probable that Paul's doctrine of Christ as the Last Adam and his conception of the new humanity is built upon Jesus' view of Himself as Son of Man, though the designation "Last Adam" is peculiar to Paul. Other names of Jesus which he uses, such as the Christ, the Lord, and the Son of God, are found elsewhere in the New Testament, but the designation of Jesus as the Last Adam belongs to him alone.

CONCLUSION

Though this title was not the most often employed in Paul's understanding of the Person of Christ it nevertheless played an important rôle--probably a far more important rôle in his thought than these scanty references in I Corinthians and Romans would lead us to believe. No doubt the Apostle had used this analogy in his preaching and teaching at the church in Corinth. His argument in I Corinthians would hardly have been intelligible unless his readers had already been familiarized with the unique relation with which Christ and Adam stand to the rest of humanity, and the power of the deeds of the Crucified and Risen Lord to atone for the transgression of Adam. But while the Last Adam Christology is significant in Paul's understanding of the resurrection, we cannot justifiably say that it is the Apostle's most characteristic or expressive designation of the

J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, II, pp. 485 f.; J. N. Sanders, op. cit., p. 134.

Risen Lord, as some have thought.⁴⁶ Certainly it is not as significant as the designation "Lord," which we have examined. Perhaps the reason why the Last Adam expression is not Paul's characteristic one is that given by Professor Black: "The Apostle preferred to express his thoughts about Christ in terms which point upwards to the transcendent Lord rather than earthwards and backwards, in 'the second man' or 'the last Adam'."⁴⁷ However, as we have seen, this concept played a central rôle in Paul's thought of the Risen Lord and it provided the Apostle with the "scaffolding, if not the basic structure, for his redemption and resurrection Christology."⁴⁸

⁴⁶Cf. Willibald Beyschlag, op. cit., II, pp. 64, 66; Somerville, op. cit., who makes this idea the theme of his book; G. B. Stevens, The Theology of the New Testament, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1918), p. 392.

⁴⁷Op. cit., p. 172.

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 173.

V: GENERAL CONCLUSION

Christ's resurrection meant more than the fact of His being raised from the dead and appearing to His disciples--more than the Father's not permitting His Holy One to see corruption. The resurrection was the interpretative factor in the disciples' complete understanding of the Person of Christ. In its light they re-interpreted all that had happened in Jesus' ministry, and that which once had been unfathomable enigmas was now open to their understanding.

The crucifixion of Jesus had proven to be a stumbling block to the disciples because the idea of a suffering and dying Messiah was foreign to the mind of Jesus' contemporaries. But in the light of the resurrection, Peter, as well as the disciples after him, understood the cross to be an integral part of God's eternal purpose, and by the resurrection, He who had claimed to be the One sent from God was now clearly recognized as the Messiah. While the title "Christ" was understandable to the Jews, the thought of the Risen One as "Lord" was understandable to both Jews and Gentiles. This title was more than a form of address or title of respect as it had been during Jesus' earthly ministry. Its use by the disciples connotes the intense personal devotion to Him who was Lord over all principalities and powers. Its Christological significance is evident from its extensive use in the disciples' various expressions of worship.

Also significant is the fact that Christ's Sonship was re-appraised.

While Christ was the pre-existent and eternal Son, His resurrection only proclaimed this Sonship as that of power and of glory. This same Risen Jesus who is now seen as the Christ, the Lord, the Son of God, is also known as the Last Adam. As the Last Adam Christ is the author of the new aeon and the Head of the new humanity, a life-giving spirit. By His death and resurrection He challenged the right of sin and death to rule over Adam's world. He has invaded Adam's world and made it His own. As we have seen, the earliest disciples began to re-evaluate the Person of Christ in light of the resurrection, but it was left largely to the Apostle Paul to develop and express the disciples' fuller understanding of the Exalted Christ.

EMMA STRONG

PART III

THE SOTERIOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESURRECTION

BOSTON

ESTHER STRONG

THE SOTERIOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESURRECTION

I: INTRODUCTION

Soteriology, the doctrine of Christ's saving work, is rooted in Christology, the doctrine of the Person of Christ. As an event which happened to Jesus, the resurrection had its first meaning for Jesus Himself, as we have seen. But apart from its significance for Christ the resurrection has vital importance for the church and for that receptive attitude of faith which Christ's work was designed to produce. By His resurrection Christ entered upon the full possession of His Messianic powers and thereby began His heavenly reign which has meaning for those who look upon Him as Lord. Thus while the resurrection works backwards in bringing Jesus back to life and in giving His earthly life God's seal of approval, it moves forward in opening the doors to new and greater acts of God.

To say that Christ has been exalted and given a place of honour at the right hand of God should not, and does not, imply that He is inactive. An essential part of the basic message of the apostolic church is the fact that Christ now takes up an active rôle in carrying out the further work of the Father. Christ did not become passive or lose touch with His people; rather He has living interest in the life of the church and plays a central rôle in the continuing life of His people. The Risen Christ is now freed from the limitations which hampered Him in the first phase of His ministry. Jesus had sent out the seventy disciples to bear witness

in and around Palestine during His earthly ministry (Luke 10:1 ff.), but after His resurrection the Risen Christ sends forth His disciples with the "Great Commission" to go to the uttermost part of the earth (Matt. 28:19; Luke 24:47; Acts 1:8). John Robson rightly affirms, "It is only by the Resurrection that the universal aim of the gospel is to be explained."¹ This did not mean that the disciples were taking over the work of Christ, rather they were sharing it with Him. Jesus was now reigning as Messiah and Lord, and the message to the disciples from the resurrection appearances and the empty tomb told them that the leadership they had known, and learned to rely upon, was to continue.²

THE RELATION OF THE CROSS AND THE RESURRECTION

To say that the resurrection is related to the work of Christ necessitates that we should say something about the relation between the resurrection and the work of Christ in reference to the cross. Certainly the cross is central to the Christian gospel, but the New Testament never speaks abstractly about the passion and cross of Christ. As Barth has

¹The Resurrection Gospel: A Study of Christ's Great Commission (Edinburgh: Oliphant Anderson & Ferrier, 1908), p. 70.

²Cf. T. W. Manson, The Servant-Messiah, pp. 96 ff. Floyd V. Filson (Jesus Christ The Risen Lord, p. 165) says: "Our Protestant churches too often have thought of Easter as the end of the church year and of Jesus' resurrection as the end of the gospel story. The period of the church then becomes a time of inaction for Christ, who has no role or task in the present period. The New Testament never suggests this idea. For its writers, Jesus' resurrection is the open door through which he entered upon the further work which in God's plan he was still to accomplish."

said, "It [the passion of Christ] always appears limited, illumined and verified by the reality of His resurrection--and that is what makes it central."³ The death of Jesus, while early recognized as part of God's plan, was not thought of in itself in terms of victory--only the resurrection was so interpreted in the earliest preaching (e. g. Acts 2:24, 36; I Cor. 15:54, 55, 57). But in the later epistles the cross itself is explained as a victory won in the battle against evil. According to Colossians 2:14, 15, Christ cancelled the evil powers by triumphing over them in His cross (cf. Eph. 2:14-16).

The Cross and Resurrection Inseparable

In the New Testament we see that Christ's death is coupled at first with His resurrection. Professor G. H. C. Macgregor says:

In the Markan tradition, except two or three times and then merely allusively (e.g. Mk. 2:19f.; 3:6), the death is scarcely mentioned without an almost automatic reference to the resurrection and exaltation to glory. It is by His death that Christ saves; but in the earliest tradition the death alone has small place in the plan of salvation. It would in fact be nothing but an incomprehensible scandal apart from the resurrection, by which Christ was rehabilitated after His ignominious condemnation; and it is Christ vindicated by the resurrection rather than Christ hanged on the tree, who has power to save ('The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree. Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins' (Ac. 5:30 f.)).⁴

³K. Barth, The Doctrine of the Word of God, p. 110.

⁴"The Growth of the Resurrection Faith," Part I, op. cit., p. 217. Cf. W. Künneth, Theologie der Auferstehung, Vierte Auflage (1951), pp. 131 ff. Bultmann (Theology of the New Testament, II, p. 157) says: "The work of salvation as a whole consists of Christ's incarnation, his passion and death, his resurrection and exaltation, but sometimes one item, some-

The Exalted Christ would not be Lord unless He had died for our offences (Rom. 4:24), but while the cross is central it is not the climax of the gospel. The symbol of the Christian faith is not the crucifix--Christ upon the cross--but rather the empty cross.⁵

Had Paul thought that the resurrection was only the reversal of the undeserved fate to which Jesus had submitted and nothing more than his rehabilitation, then it could not have brought such far-reaching consequences; it would not have created a new order of things. It might have saved Jesus but it would not have saved mankind. Thus Bultmann says, ". . . the resurrection is not a mythological event adduced in order to prove the saving efficiency of the cross, but an article of faith just as much as the meaning of the cross itself."⁶

The question as to which the Apostle regarded as the more important, the cross or the resurrection, is out of place and void of meaning. The two are inseparably bound together and they reciprocally condition each other. Kunneth has pointed out their close relationship.

Zunächst ist festzustellen, dass das Heilseignis des Kreuzes und das der Auferstehung in unlösbarer Einheit verbunden ist, dass

times another, may be mentioned and emphasized. By and large, however, the chief emphasis lies upon his passion and death."

⁵Floyd V. Filson, "The Focus of History: The Resurrection in Biblical Theology," Interpretation, II, No. 1 (Jan., 1948), p. 28. Cf. E. C. Rust, The Christian Understanding of History, p. 164; Adolf Schlatter, The Church in the New Testament Period, trans. by Paul P. Levertoff (London: S.P.C.K., 1955), p. 7; Kenneth E. Kirk, "The Atonement," in Essays Catholic & Critical, ed. by Edward Gordon Selwyn, 3rd ed. (London: S.P.C.K., 1929), pp. 259-262.

⁶"New Testament and Mythology," Keryzma and Myth, p. 41.

9
weder das Wort vom Kreuz ohne die Auferstehungsbotschaft gegeben ist noch diese ohne die Kreuzestatsache, dass demnach ein Absehen von der einen wie von der anderen Aussage theologisch unmöglich ist. Der Auferstandene ist der Herr, weil er der Gekreuzigte ist und der Gekreuzigte ist nur deshalb der $\tau\omega\tau\eta\rho$, weil er der erhöhte Herr ist.⁷

They stand in the relation of a question and its answer, a riddle and its interpretation.⁸

Likewise, Karl Barth closely relates the death and resurrection because, taken together, they effectively express the reconciling will of God.⁹ The positive connection between the death and resurrection consists in the fact that these two acts of God, with and after one another, are the two basic events of the one history of God with a sinful and corrupt world. The one concerns our trespasses, the other our justification (Rom. 4:25).¹⁰

⁷ Op. cit., Vierte Auflage, pp. 131 f. In thinking of the death as punishment and the resurrection as the lifting of the punishment, Kunneth (p. 137) says: "Die Auferstehung kann Heilsverwirklichung sein, weil sie nicht bloss den Tod Jesu als Strafe, die von Gott verhängt ist, erkennen lässt, sondern als die Erwerbung aus dem Tode diese Strafe aufhebt und dadurch von der Schuld befreit."

⁸ Ibid., p. 132. Cf. A. M. Ramsey, The Resurrection of Christ, p. 16, who suggests: "We discover as we read the New Testament that the two events [cross and resurrection], seen first as opposites, are found increasingly to be like the two sides of a coin" (see pp. 16-19). Cf. also Elias Andrews, The Meaning of Christ For Paul (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949), p. 49.

⁹ The Doctrine of Reconciliation, pp. 309 f. Cf. Church Dogmatics, Vol. II, First half-vol.: The Doctrine of God, trans. by T. H. L. Parker et al. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1957), p. 394. Cf. also A. W. Argyle, "The New Testament Doctrine of the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ," E.T., LXI, No. 6 (March, 1950), p. 188.

¹⁰ The Doctrine of Reconciliation, pp. 309 f.

The fact that the alteration of our situation is made in both events does not mean that their sequence and correspondence is that of repetition, or that their relationship is that of the unity of two equal factors, of which either the one or the other might appear to be superfluous or simply a closer definition. On the contrary, it is a genuine sequence and correspondence in a differentiated relationship in which both factors have their proper form and function. In all this alteration we have to do with the conversion of man to God and therefore with his reconciliation and that of the world with God. It is, therefore, clear that we have to distinguish a terminus a quo and a terminus ad quem: first, a negative event (with a positive intention), a turning away (for the purpose of turning to), a removing (in the sense of a positing), a putting off (with a view to a putting on, II Cor. 5:2, Eph. 4:22-24), a freeing from something (with a view to freeing for something else); then a positive event (with a negative presupposition), a turning to (made possible by a definite turning from), a putting on (after a previous putting off), a freeing for something (based upon a freeing from something else). According to the resurrection the death of Jesus Christ as the negative act of God took place with a positive intention. It had as its aim the turning of man to Himself, his positing afresh, his putting on a new life, his freeing for the future. And, according to the prior death of Jesus Christ, the resurrection had this negative presupposition in a radical turning of man from his own existence, in a total removing of man in his earlier form, in his absolute putting off, in his complete freeing from the past. It is in this correspondence that we see their difference but also their relationship--which is, of course, necessarily a differentiated relationship.¹¹

Man's confrontation with the Crucified is not sufficient; to approach God and be acceptable it is necessary that one encounter the

¹¹The Doctrine of Reconciliation, p. 310. Cf. E. Brunner, The Mediator, pp. 582 f.; K. H. Rengstorff, Die Auferstehung Jesu, pp. 48 f., 54 f., 82 f.; A. M. Ramsey, The Gospel and the Catholic Church, 2nd ed. (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1956), p. 26. Ramsey (The Resurrection of Christ, p. 19) says: "So it is that the centre of Apostolic Christianity is Crucifixion-Resurrection; not Crucifixion alone nor Resurrection alone, nor even Crucifixion as the prelude and Resurrection as the finale, but the blending of the two in a way that is as real to the Gospel as it is defiant to the world."

Risen Christ.¹² But at the same time the resurrection does not crowd out the fact of the cross or its vital rôle in expressing the very nature of God and of Christ. Again Barth comments:

A theologia gloriae, the magnifying of what Jesus has received for us in His resurrection, of what He is for us as the risen One, can have no meaning unless it includes within itself a theologia crucis, the magnifying of what He has done for us in His death, of what He is for us as the Crucified. We cannot properly magnify the passion and death of Jesus Christ unless this magnifying includes within itself the theologia gloriae--the magnifying of the One who in His resurrection is the recipient of our right and life, the One who has risen again from the dead for us.¹³

While Paul closely relates the cross and the resurrection in his thinking, he can refer to the resurrection without mentioning the death.¹⁴ For example, in Romans 10:9 one might be led to think that the belief in the resurrection is the sole basis for salvation: "If you confess with your lips that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved." But the thought here is determined by the context rather than a belief on Paul's part that death and resurrec-

¹² Rengstorff, Die Auferstehung Jesu, p. 48.

¹³ The Doctrine of Reconciliation, pp. 557 f. Cf. E. Brunner, Eternal Hope, p. 581; A. L. Lilley, "The Faith of the Resurrection as 'Life in Christ,'" Theology, XXIX, No. 172 (Oct., 1934), pp. 201 f. Professor J. S. Stewart (A Faith To Proclaim, p. 110) says: "... men may gaze at the Cross and miss the Gospel that saves, if they are still on the wrong side of Easter. It is a strange thing that volumes have sometimes been written on the theology of the Atonement which stop short at the Cross, ignoring the Resurrection or relegating it to a very secondary place. The effect of such works is unsatisfying and depressing. For there is no such thing as atonement and reconciliation apart from the resurrection."

¹⁴ Cf. Rom. 1:4; 8:11; 10:9; I Cor. 6:14; II Cor. 4:14; I Thess. 1:10.

tion could be separated in their meaning for salvation. That which Paul received and preached included the connection of the death and resurrection as together being one gospel. This is made clear in I Corinthians 15:3, 4: "For I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received, that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures, that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the scriptures." Paul makes it clear that he considers the resurrection vital to his interpretation of the death of Christ. "Christ died for our sins," but "if Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile and you are still in your sins" (I Cor. 15:3, 17). Paul puts it negatively, that if God had not raised Jesus from the dead, there would not have been the divine confirmation of the value of Christ's death. The mission of the Redeemer would have been denied by God rather than affirmed and man's faith in the value of the sacrificial death would have been in vain.

Other statements confirm the fact that Paul held the death and resurrection in conjunction as part of the one saving act. "Is it Christ Jesus, who died, yes, who was raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God, who indeed intercedes for us?"¹⁵ "For to this end Christ died and lived again, that he might be Lord both of the dead and the living" (Rom. 14:9). "And he died for all, that those who live might live no longer for themselves but for him who for their sake died and was raised" (II Cor. 5:15). The Apostle seeks to "know him and the power of his resurrection" that he may share His sufferings and death (Phil. 3:

¹⁵Rom. 8:34.

10). "For since we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so, through Jesus, God will bring with him those who have fallen asleep" (I Thess. 4:14).

In the same manner in which Paul refers to the resurrection without actually mentioning the death, he can speak of the death of Jesus without mentioning His resurrection. For example, he can say that he knows nothing but "Christ and him crucified" (I Cor. 2:2), but this does not mean that he is omitting the resurrection in his thought. In connection with this point Professor John Knox suggests:

At first sight this last phrase [Christ and him crucified] used by the Apostle seems to leave out the Resurrection entirely. But it seems to do so because we suppose Paul's thought was moving, as ours customarily does, in a forward direction. When we read the phrase "Christ and him crucified," we think of the human Jesus, of his life of devotion and service, and our minds then move forward to the cross; but when Paul wrote the phrase, he was thinking first of all of the risen, exalted Christ, and his thought moved backward to the cross. . . . His attention, as it moves backward, is arrested by the Crucifixion, which itself epitomizes so perfectly the theological significance and the moral character of the whole earthly life that he does not look beyond it; having begun, so to speak, from the end of the book, he has already reached the climax of the story. Thus, far from omitting reference to the Resurrection, Paul's phrase takes its start from it. . . .¹⁶

Perhaps Paul speaks more often of the cross and spends more time explaining its meaning, but this is because the significance of the cross demands

¹⁶Chapters in a Life of Paul (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1954), pp. 130 f. On the basis of Knox's reasoning, it is understandable that the church's weekly day of worship did not commemorate the death on the cross, but rather the resurrection. Vide supra the discussion of Sunday as the Lord's Day; also, Arnold Meyer, Die moderne Forschung über Geschichte des Urchristentums (Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr, 1898), p. 31; E. Brunner, The Mediator, p. 582.

interpretation whereas the resurrection more readily explains itself.¹⁷

The Resurrection the Starting-Point in Understanding the Work of Christ

In the light of the above, it seems imperative that we think of the resurrection as the starting-point in Paul's endeavour to fathom the work of Christ.¹⁸ Dr. Floyd V. Filson says:

¹⁷Cf. Wrede, Paul, pp. 100 f.; G. Aulén, Christus Victor, p. 82. A. M. Ramsey (The Resurrection of Christ, p. 116) points out that "In the Church of the Fathers it was specially the East that held the Resurrection in its central place. The Greek theologians seldom isolated the Cross; and the atonement meant to them the victory of the Resurrection, whereby nature rejoices in a new creation and whereby mankind may share in the risen life of Christ and so become partakers of the divine nature. Similarly the worship of the Eastern Church has clung to the Resurrection in a way that the West, both Latin and Reformed, has strangely missed." See also the later work by Ramsey, The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1949), pp. 135 ff. and Stefan Zankov, The Eastern Orthodox Church, trans. by Donald A. Lowrie (London: SCM, 1929), p. 55. Cf. also Nicholas Arseniew's works, "Easter Joy in the Eastern Liturgy," in Mysticism and the Eastern Church, trans. by Arthur Chambers (London: S.C.M., 1926), pp. 31-44, cf. p. 61, and We Beheld His Glory, trans. by Mary Anita Ewer (London: S.P.C.K., 1937), pp. 115, 141, and elsewhere. Woodrow A. Geir, "God Revealed," Religion in Life, XXII, No. 2 (Spring, 1953), p. 213, points out that "the Russian word yoskresenye, which means resurrection, also means Sunday and Easter. Every time the member of the Eastern Orthodox Church says 'Sunday' they say [he says] in effect, 'This is the day we celebrate the Resurrection.'"

¹⁸See Rudolf Steiner, From Jesus to Christ (London: The Rudolf Steiner Publishing Co., 1930), pp. 85 f.; Westcott, The Gospel of the Resurrection, p. 113; Jakób Jocz, The Jewish People and Jesus Christ: A Study in the Relationship between the Jewish People and Jesus Christ (London: S.P.C.K., 1949), p. 152; Harald Stahlin, "The New Exodus of Salvation According to St Paul," in The Root of the Vine, p. 91.

In his commentary on Isa. 53:3 Calvin insisted that if one is to comprehend the Lord's strength and power one must begin with the death of Christ, the resurrection being the second member in an irreversible order (Commentaires sur le Prophète Isaïe, ed. and trans. by Nicolas des Gallars, Geneva: François Perrin, 1572, p. 332). See Paul van Buren, Christ In Our Place (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957), pp. 81-86, for

. . . We frequently hear the gospel summarily described as the gospel of the Cross, and it may seem that here at last is the center we seek. The only reason we thus think, however, is that something else has given us the angle of vision. To become clear about this, we may well pause and think what the crucifixion meant to the disciples on the day after it happened, or to Paul before he met the risen Christ. No one ever preached the gospel of the Cross who had not also become convinced of the Resurrection and thereby gained a new view of what the crucifixion meant. He who thinks he is starting with the Cross is really starting with a view of the Cross which he received from the Resurrection.¹⁹

Professor Filson, who is the foremost exponent of this view (certainly in the English-speaking world), thinks that recent trends in biblical studies, particularly that of form criticism and apostolic preaching, support his conclusion.²⁰

Before this emphasis upon the resurrection by Professor Filson, Dr. Walter Kunneth pointed out that the significance of the preaching of the cross is dependent on the message of the resurrection.²¹ He states

Calvin's thought on the relation of the resurrection to the death of Christ. Professor William Manson, Jesus the Messiah, p. 161, thinks of the cross as the starting-point of Pauline theology. However, he says this not over against the resurrection as the starting-point, but that of Paul's doctrines of sin and the cross, the cross comes first. J. N. Sanders, The Foundations of the Christian Faith, p. 131, thinks of the experience of the Holy Spirit as the starting-point for Paul's theology (see pp. 129-132). Again, Sanders says this not over against the resurrection as the starting-point, but in showing the reality and power of the Holy Spirit in the Apostle's life.

¹⁹"The Focus of History: The Resurrection in Biblical Theology," loc. cit.

²⁰Ibid. Cf. pp. 28 ff.; also Filson's Jesus Christ The Risen Lord, pp. 25 ff.; Aulén, The Faith of the Christian Church, p. 246.

²¹Op. cit. (Vierte Auflage), pp. 132 f.

that without the resurrection the message of the death of Jesus would be kept in complete darkness and would have no soteriological significance. Only the Easter interpretation of the cross can elevate the end of Jesus above the contingent and questionable things of history and make His cross a salvation event. All the statements of the cross theology are subject to the sign or prognostic (Vorzeichen) of the resurrection; without this sign they lose sense and validity. He who speaks theologically of the cross of Jesus speaks at the same time of the resurrection because this only is the root and power of the message of the cross.

. . . Because the interpretation of the death of Jesus depends on His resurrection, and because the life is "stronger" than death, the resurrection of Jesus is in principle superior to the cross of Jesus. The resurrection life of Christ means to Paul a stronger salvation assurance than the death of Jesus. Therefore any genuine theologia crucis is not merely at the same time a theologia resurrectionis, but it is the conditional foundation for it. Paul says that doubting the resurrection is the same as rejecting the gospel.²²

In conclusion, we see that the resurrection is related to the cross as not merely the divine Amen to Christ's death, but is the reverse side

²²Ibid. See also p. 133, note 9. [The above is the author's paraphrase and translation of Kunneth's work.] A. M. Ramsey (The Resurrection of Christ, p. 7) says: "We are tempted to believe that, although the Resurrection may be the climax of the Gospel, there is yet a Gospel that stands upon its own feet and may be understood and appreciated before we pass on to the Resurrection. The first disciples did not find it so. For them the Gospel without the Resurrection was not merely a Gospel without its final chapter; it was not a Gospel at all."

of the cross, the one being dependent on the other. But what is more important, the resurrection is the starting-point or the interpretative principle for understanding the significance of the cross because the cross has to be viewed in the light of the resurrection.

BULSTON

EMMA STRONG

II: THE HOLY SPIRIT

Having entered into full Messianic dignity at His resurrection, the Risen Christ gives the Holy Spirit which was a manifestation of His new sovereign power. That in the last days of the Messianic age the Spirit should be poured out, not only on the prophetic order but on all the people of Yahweh, had been clearly foretold. It was the great promise of the Father, conveyed through Isaiah (32:15), Joel (2:28 f., which Peter employs in Acts 2:14 ff.) and Zechariah (12:10), and on the eve of its fulfilment the promise had been revived by the Lord Himself (Acts 1:4, 5).

THE RISEN CHRIST AND THE HOLY SPIRIT

To appreciate fully the fact of the Risen Lord's sending the Spirit we must remember the relation in which Jesus stood all along to the Holy Spirit. Even during His life on earth He possessed the fulness of the Spirit. At the very beginning of His ministry in the synagogue at Nazareth He applied to Himself the language of ancient prophecy, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me" (Luke 4:18), and, in so applying it, He obviously intended to express the character of His ministry as a whole. Accordingly, in the light of His own claim thus distinctly made, it is imperative that we think of Jesus as One who, from the beginning to the close of His Messianic work, was dwelt in, moulded, guided, encouraged,

and strengthened, by the Spirit. Indeed, the Apostle Paul assumed that God raised His Son through (δὲ), or by means of, the Spirit.¹ In his doctoral thesis Neill Q. Hamilton states, "The resurrection and exaltation are but two sides of the one continuous act of the Spirit whereby Jesus was raised from death to the exaltation life of His Lordship."² Thus the Spirit was the agent of Christ's resurrection, and, as such, He was related to the glory and exaltation of Christ as Lord.

Peter's Sermon and the Testimony of the Gospels

The sending of the Spirit is thought of by the Apostles as the action of the Exalted Lord by which He carries on His work on earth, and secures the ends for which He lived and died. Peter states: "Being therefore exalted at the right hand of God and having received from the

¹Cf. Rom. 8:11: "If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ Jesus from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through his Spirit which dwells in you." The RSV translators here follow the genitive reading (δὲ τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος αὐτοῦ πνεύματος) in agreement with the Alexandrine authorities, rather than the alternate accusative reading (δὲ τὸ ἐνοικοῦν αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα) which has the support of the Western authorities. See Neill Q. Hamilton, op. cit., pp. 18 f., who gives an excellent discussion of the verse as well as reference to the authorities who prefer the accusative reading.

²Ibid., p. 14. See pp. 12 ff. Hamilton suggests that in Rom. 6:4 the phrase "by the glory of the Father" has indirect reference to the Spirit; likewise he thinks the phrase "the power of God" in II Cor. 13:4 refers to the Spirit, which Christ needed ("In some sense") even after the resurrection. Cf. Geerhardus Vos, "The Eschatological Aspect of the Pauline Conception of the Spirit," Biblical and Theological Studies, pp. 234 ff. In the introduction to his thesis, Hamilton acknowledges Vos as the one who first dealt directly with the eschatological significance of the Pauline Conception of the Spirit.

Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he has poured out³ this which you see and hear" (Acts 2:33). Christ is the giver of the Spirit, the fulfiller of the promise of the Father. Thus while the church saw itself as directly under the Lordship of Christ, this Lordship (as also the assurance of the Fatherhood of God) was mediated through the Spirit.

Apart from Acts 2:33 we find few specific statements that it is the Risen Christ who gives the Holy Spirit. However, in all four of the Gospels John the Baptist is represented as stating that the One coming after him is to baptize with the Holy Spirit.⁴ The Fourth Gospel asserts: "Now this he said about the Spirit, which those who believed in him were to receive; for as yet the Spirit had not been given, because Jesus was not yet glorified" (John 7:39). John says that Jesus will send the Holy Spirit (15:26; 16:7; cf. 14:16, 26), and he explicitly states that Jesus breathed upon the disciples on the evening of the resurrection day and said, "Receive the Holy Spirit" (20:22). Thus the Fourth Evangelist portrays in dramatic form what the rest of the New Testament agrees or implies was true. According to him, the gift of the Holy Spirit takes place on the first Easter day; according to Acts, the actual gift of the

³ Joel uses the same verb $\epsilon\kappa\chi\epsilon\hat{\omega}$, 2:28 (LXX).

⁴ Some interpreters would hold that John predicted only a baptism of fire (i. e. a judgment) and would eliminate reference to a baptism with the Spirit, holding that the latter was erroneously introduced into the tradition. See G. B. Caird, The Apostolic Age (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd., 1955), p. 50, note 2; M. Goguel, "Le caractère du salut dans la théologie paulinienne," B.N.T.I.E., p. 337.

Spirit is on the fiftieth day. G. H. C. Macgregor has well commented upon this apparent variance:

But both traditions bear witness to the fact that, as a result of the Resurrection, the disciples became conscious of a new inward power which completely transformed their whole outlook; and this they attributed to the possession of the Spirit of God.⁵

There are references that indicate that the procession of the Spirit is from the Father (John 14:26; 15:26; 20:22; cf. Rom. 8:9; I Cor. 2:11; Gal. 4:6).⁶ Floyd V. Filson says:

Concerning this and many other divine gifts and actions the New Testament can say either that God the Father does them, or that Christ does them, or that God does them through Christ. Part of the evidence for the high and unique role of Christ in the New Testament

⁵"The Acts of the Apostles," I.B., IX (1954), p. 36. Some would insist that the reference in John 20:20 is to a separate sending of the Spirit from the one in Acts describing Pentecost. Thus R. M'Cheyne Edgar, The Gospel of a Risen Saviour (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1892), p. 336, says: "The gift of the Spirit in the Pentecost was similar in kind to that received on the resurrection evening, and only differed in degree. The first was a zephyr breath, the second was a resistless storm." A. E. J. Rawlinson, "The Filioque Clause," S.J.T., X, No. 2 (June, 1957), p. 167, suggests that the reference in John 20:20 is to a "temporal" mission of the Holy Spirit. William Temple, Readings in St. John's Gospel, pp. 386 f., says that the reference is not to the Holy Spirit: "What is bestowed is not the Divine Person Himself but the power and energy of which He is the source." E. C. Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, II, p. 653, gives the best answer: "The Resurrection scenes in the Fourth Gospel are all preparatory scenes, preparatory for the mission. What the Lord will do invisibly from heaven He here does visibly on earth. The mission is inaugurated, but not actually begun. . . The actual beginning of the mission lies outside the scope of the Fourth Gospel. There remains, therefore, room for the Pentecostal outpouring, after which the disciples take up the mission in public in the power of the Spirit descending from Father and Son in heaven."

⁶While the author cannot go into the Filioque controversy he refers the reader to A. E. J. Rawlinson's recent article, "The Filioque Clause," op. cit., pp. 166-173, for an excellent treatment of the subject and a helpful bibliography for references.

faith and thought is precisely this recurrent intertwining of the work of the Father and the Son in actions and gifts which can only be expected and received from the divine source. So the fact that according to some statements the Father sends the Spirit does not discredit or conflict with other early Christian testimonies that Christ sends the Spirit to his church.⁷

By the heightening of His powers after the resurrection, Christ was so made one with the very life of God as to be constituted a perfect medium through whom the Spirit could act upon men.

Paul's Testimony and Development

As we have seen (judging from Acts 2:33), the Spirit appears as the gift of the glorified Christ, but Paul thinks of the Spirit as not just an objective gift. Geerhardus Vos has suggested:

The Spirit becomes his [Christ's] own subjective possession, the Spirit dwelling in him, the source of his own glorified life, so that when he communicates the Spirit he communicates of his own, whence also the possession of the Spirit works in the believer a mystical, vital union with Christ. While Peter's teaching leaves full room for this whole rich Pauline development, it does not yet contain this development.⁸

This development is illustrated by Paul's statement in II Corinthians 3:17 where he relates the activity of the Risen Lord with that of the Spirit: "The Lord is the Spirit." This is not to say that Paul is equating the Person of Christ with that of the Spirit as some scholars maintain.⁹

⁷Jesus Christ The Risen Lord, p. 166. Cf. also William Milligan, The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord, 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1894), p. 182.

⁸"The Eschatological Aspect of the Pauline Conception of the Spirit," op. cit., p. 242. Vide infra Paul's mysticism, pp. 197 ff.

⁹E.g. John Knox, Christ The Lord: The Meaning of Jesus in the

It is evident that Paul is not here giving a theoretic description of the essence or substance of the Lord, which justifies a metaphysical identification of Christ with the "Holy Spirit," but is describing him as a source of spiritual blessing to those who turn to him.¹⁰

To the Apostle the Spirit and the Risen Christ are so inseparably bound up in one, and they act so absolutely for the same end, and through the same means, that from the practical standpoint they are one; to turn to the one was to turn to the other. However, it probably never occurred to him that they could be thought of as identical.

In II Corinthians, especially 13:14 (cf. 11:4), the Apostle repeatedly speaks of Christ and the Spirit as separate, and this is true because the identity of Christ with the historic Jesus is too clear for him to permit his identifying Christ with the Spirit. Professor Filson has said:

The memory of the historical career of Jesus Christ is too vivid and too influential to permit the fusing of the living Christ with the Holy Spirit in Christian thought and worship. . . Moreover, the influence of the historical career is so strong that it not only prevents the Christian view from absorbing the living Christ into

Early Church (New York: Willet, Clark and Co., 1941), pp. 66 f. See E. Andrews, op. cit., pp. 147 ff., for an answer to Knox. Cf. also D. R. Griffiths, "'The Lord is the Spirit' (2 Corinthians iii. 17, 18)," E.T., LV, No. 3 (Dec., 1943), pp. 81-83, for many helpful references and a discussion of the problem.

¹⁰G. B. Stevens, The Theology of the New Testament, p. 443. Julius Koegel, "ὁ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστίν," in Aus Schrift und Geschichte (theological essays presented to Adolf Schlatter on his 70th birthday), Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, Stuttgart, 1922, points out the soteriological significance of the passage: "Die Identität [between the Lord and the Spirit] hat speziell in soteriologischer Beziehung statt" (p. 43). . . "die Aussage 2 Kor. 3,17 . . . hat . . . nicht eine metaphysische, sondern eine soteriologische Bedeutung" (p. 44). (As cited by Hamilton, op. cit., p. 6, notes 1 and 3.)

the Spirit, but actually determines the work of the Spirit, whose role is to continue and broaden the work of the earthly Christ.¹¹

It is true that in Romans 8:9-11 one finds it difficult to distinguish Christ and the Spirit because the Spirit is successively called "the Spirit," "the Spirit of God," "the Spirit of Christ," "Christ," and "the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead." Elsewhere the Apostle says, "God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts" (Gal. 4:6), and "I know that through your prayers and the help of the Spirit of Jesus Christ this will turn out for my deliverance" (Phil. 1:19).¹² But Paul can make this statement in II Corinthians 3:17 because the Lord is the Risen Christ who now has a "spiritual body" and has become "a life-giving spirit" (I Cor. 15:44-45); He and the Spirit are one in nature and share in the active guidance of the church.¹³ The Spirit is called the Spirit of Christ as having Christ for His theme, His office being to bear witness to, interpret, and glorify Christ, and thus to carry on His work on earth. As Neill Q. Hamilton says, "The Holy Spirit is now the vehicle, the mode, the manner of His status as Lord."¹⁴ The presence of the Spirit

¹¹The New Testament Against Its Environment, pp. 73 f.

¹²Cf. I Peter 1:11, "the Spirit of Christ."

¹³Floyd V. Filson, "The Second Epistle to the Corinthians," I.B., X (1954), pp. 311 f.

¹⁴Op. cit., p. 13. Cf. John 15:26 f.; 16:14. Hamilton (p. 15) goes on to say: "in the same way that God breathed the breath of life into the man of dust so that that breath and man's life became synonymous, so also at Christ's resurrection the Father breathed the Holy Spirit into His dead Son so that He lived and so that that Spirit and the life of the resurrected Christ became synonymous."

is indissolubly linked with the interest and activity of the Risen Christ.

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

While it is outside the bounds of this thesis to deal exhaustively with the work of the Holy Spirit, suffice it to say that as far as the Risen Christ is concerned, the Spirit was the power of the Risen Christ now operative in the church; the power to conform men to the likeness of the Risen Christ (II Cor. 3:17-18); to realize a new kind of fellowship between the Risen Christ and His followers (Rom. 6:5-11); to enable men to be effective witnesses in word and life to the Risen Christ (Acts 1:8). By the Spirit Jesus was present in all His exaltation, joy, and power for the aid of those who were baptized in His name.

But the resurrection power of the Spirit is not only operative in one's inner life--it operates even now upon the physical. Cullmann states:

Even now He restrains, at least for a moment, the power of death, which in spite of the defeat which it has already met still continues to exercise its claim upon men: this temporary restraining of death through the resurrection power of the Holy Spirit constitutes the deeper meaning of all the New Testament healings of the sick and raisings of the dead. Miracles of healing and of raising of the dead belong together. Even the resurrection miracles effected by Jesus in the Gospels do not represent the final transformation of the physical body, inasmuch as what is raised is only a physical body which again is corruptible; but these raisings of the dead, like the healings of the sick, do indicate that since Christ and in Christ the resurrection power is already at work. It is the Messianic time in which the New Testament places us: "The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up" (Matt. 11:5). The apostles also, by the power of

the Spirit, drive back the still constantly active power of conquered death (Acts 9:40). But none except the "first fruits" has as yet really and finally been raised, that is, been clothed with the new spiritual body.¹⁵

In one of Gullmann's later works he has further developed this idea, and he emphasizes that "to constitute the spiritual body of Christ has, by anticipation, present consequences for the bodies of the faithful."¹⁶

. . . The Church is the body of Christ on Earth, and so the only *τὴν πνευματικὴν* in existence at the moment. But this resurrection-body of Christ, the Church, consists of believers still clothed with bodies of flesh. Hence the paradox: on earth the faithful together form a resurrection body, Christ's body, and yet none of them individually possesses a resurrection-body, since all are still clothed with a body of flesh.¹⁷

The whole of Gullmann's thought presupposes the life-giving activity of the Holy Spirit--particularly in the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

The sacraments occupy the same position in the Church as the miracles in the ministry of Jesus, for they too, are miracles of the

¹⁵Oscar Gullmann, Christ and Time, pp. 236 f. Cf. John A. T. Robinson, The Body (London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1952), pp. 79 f., In the End, God. . .: A Study of the Christian Doctrine of the Last Things (London: James Clarke & Co. Ltd., 1950), pp. 96 f.; W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 317 f.; R. Reitzenstein, Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, 3rd Ed. (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1927), p. 77.

¹⁶"The Proleptic Deliverance of the Body according to the New Testament," The Early Church, ed. by A. J. B. Higgins (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1956), p. 168. The same thought is expressed in Gullmann's article "Unsterblichkeit der Seele und Auferstehung der Toten. Das Zeugnis des Neuen Testaments," Theologische Zeitschrift, XII, Heft 2 (März-April, 1956), pp. 145 ff. [now translated].

¹⁷"The Proleptic Deliverance of the Body. . .," loc. cit.

Holy Spirit. Of course, miracles in the stricter sense also continue after the resurrection. But within the body of Christ which became the Church when the Holy Spirit was poured forth on the day of Pentecost, the miracles of the Spirit are identified more and more with the efficacy of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.¹⁸

While at Baptism each individual is brought under the immediate influence of the $\tau\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$ (the glorified body of Christ--cf. I Cor. 12:13), Professor Cullmann has rightly suggested that it is primarily in the Lord's Supper that the relation between the risen body of Christ and the fleshly body of the believer is most clearly seen. "In breaking the bread we therefore enter into direct and immediate contact with the $\tau\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$ of the risen Christ, and this $\tau\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$ is at the same time the community of the faithful."¹⁹

The present possession of the Spirit is a seal (II Cor. 1:22; Eph. 4:30), a guarantee (II Cor. 5:5; Eph. 1:13, 14), a promise (Gal. 3:14), and a first-fruit or first instalment (Rom. 8:23) of the Spirit's possession of us in the life to come and of the redemption which the Father will one day complete. This Spirit, as the substratum of the resurrection life, is at work in the whole of the believer's person. As such the presence of the Spirit in a believer is more than an assurance of the ultimate resurrection status; the Spirit's indwelling is manifested by His activity as well. Life in the Spirit here issues in the resurrection,

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 170.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 171. Vide supra, pp. 115 ff., for a full discussion of Cullmann's understanding of the relation of the Lord's Supper to the resurrection.

and that because the Spirit is both the author and fundamental characteristic of the resurrection. Thus if one has the Spirit bestowed by the Risen Christ, the same power is at work in him that was in Christ.

III: JUSTIFICATION

It has long been recognized that Christ's resurrection was the divine announcement that the Crucified One was the Messiah. In raising His Son from the dead, the Father gave a decisive testimony to the fact that He was well pleased with His Son, that He accepted the sacrifice that had been offered for sin. The Father not only justified His own action in sending His Son but accepts as well the deeds of Jesus for mankind. Faith and trust in Christ could not have been attributed to One who remained dead, and had Jesus not been raised from the dead, men would have found it impossible to believe that He could give eternal life to others. Hence, the relation of the resurrection of Jesus to His atoning work is given by many commentators substantially as follows: The Christian is justified by the death of Christ who bore the penalty of sin; but faith on the part of the Christian is needed to make this justification effective, and knowledge is needed for faith. It is through the resurrection of Christ that the nature of His death was made known, and it revealed the victory and the reconciliation He had already achieved in His death on the cross. In substance, the resurrection is related to justification as an aid to faith.¹

¹See Bernhard Weiss, Biblical Theology of the New Testament, trans. from the 3rd ed. by David Eaton (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1882), I, pp. 434 ff.; R. M'Cheyne Edgar, The Gospel of a Risen Saviour, pp. 298 ff.; and G. B. Stevens, The Theology of the New Testament, p. 418, who says: "Rom. 4:25 more naturally means that Christ's death is the ground of

THE RELATION OF THE RESURRECTION TO JUSTIFICATION

But the above paragraph is only a partial statement of the apostolic view judging from what Paul says in Romans 4:25: "... [Christ] was put to death for our trespasses and raised for our justification."² This justification was God's action in declaring men righteous, in treating them as such, and in putting them right with Himself.³ The condition of justification is faith and its ground or basis is the atoning work of Christ. While the rabbinic thought had connected justification more with the end of the age, at the general resurrection and the judgment, Paul thinks of a present justification in connection with the resurrection of Christ.⁴

salvation (Heilsbegründung), and that his resurrection is the ground of faith (Glaubensbegründung)."

²The whole of Romans 4 deals with the faith of Abraham as it is related to the Christian faith. Verse 25 serves to bring the argument back, after the digression about Abraham, to the point reached in the previous chapter. Paul probably had in mind Isa. 53:11: "by his knowledge shall the righteous one, my servant, make many to be accounted righteous; and he shall bear their iniquities." This seems evident from the Apostle's use of the word *παρεδόθη* which is found in the Septuagint version of Isa. 53:12, where it occurs twice. J. Jeremias, "Christological Interpretations of the Deutero-Isaiah Servant of God in the New Testament," *The Servant of God*, p. 89, note 397, says that Rom. 4:25 is further shown to be a quotation because of Paul's use of *δικαι* with the accusative instead of his usual *ἐπέρ*. Lietzmann (*An die Römer*, p. 54) thinks of Rom. 4:25 as a confessional statement. It might well have existed before Paul and have been handed down to him, as Bultmann (*Theology of the New Testament*, I, pp. 46 f., 82) suggests.

³Surprisingly enough, Paul uses the noun *δικαίωμα* rarely, only three times--Rom. 4:25; 5:16; 5:18 (translated "acquittal" in RSV). He prefers to use the verb *δικαιῶ*, which he uses over twenty times in Romans, Galatians, and I Corinthians.

⁴Cf. Vincent Taylor, *Forgiveness and Reconciliation*, pp. 35 ff.

Justification an Accomplished Fact through the Resurrection

The resurrection is necessary for our justification not merely as certifying the atoning efficacy of the death, but because justification became an accomplished fact and effective reality only through Christ's rising again. The apostolic thought accordingly is this: His rising again was the necessary antecedent to His applying to His disciples the virtue of the atonement which His death had made possible. As J. H. Newman put it, "He died to purchase what He rose again to apply."⁵ Thus Woodrow A. Geier, who sees the earthly living, dying, and rising of Christ as aspects of one event, the dropping of a plumb line from eternity, can say, "The Resurrection is the Event that completes the whole redemptive action of God in history. Without it, there would be no Christian faith."⁶

The resurrection not only warrants faith in the atoning value of His death, but makes possible a new life-principle for us. On the death of Christ there followed His life as the Risen One (Rom. 5:10), and when one puts his faith in God's righteous decision carried out in Him, one immediately becomes a sharer in Christ's triumph. In this context Paul uses the significant phrase "much more" (πολλῷ μᾶλλον) twice: "Since, therefore, we are now justified by his blood, much more shall we

⁵Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification, 3rd ed. (London: Rivingtons, 1874), p. 206. R. H. J. Steuart, "The Resurrection," The Month, CLXXXI, No. 944 (March-April, 1945), p. 109, says: "It [the resurrection] is to that what the signature is to a cheque, by which alone the sum for which it is drawn can be realized and is made available."

⁶"God Revealed," Religion in Life, XXII, No. 2 (Spring, 1953), p. 212.

be saved by him from the wrath of God. For if while we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, now that we are reconciled, shall we be saved by his life" (Rom. 5:9, 10). His risen life ushered his disciples into a new aeon. Thus the resurrection is immediately related to and directly integrated with the working out of God's plan of salvation. No doubt, the Apostle always thought of Christ's resurrection, not merely as the proof that His death was accepted by God, but as immediately related to His redemptive work.

Justification Inseparably Linked with Both the Death and Resurrection

It is true that we generally find justification coupled with the death of Christ in Paul's thought.⁷ Hence it has been asked how Paul can connect justification with the resurrection here in Romans 4:25. But this reveals a manner of thought which is foreign to Paul as he recognizes no such alternative. To him the death and the resurrection of Christ belong inseparably together,⁸ and taken together they constitute the basis of justification. Without the resurrection the death of Christ would be meaningless to Paul: "If Christ has not been raised your faith is futile and you are still in your sins" (I Cor. 15:17). If Christ is dead and not risen then His death has no reconciling and justifying efficacy.⁹

⁷Cf. Rom. 3:24 f. and 5:9.

⁸Vide supra pp. 169 ff.

⁹Cf. A. Sabatier, The Apostle Paul, trans. by A. M. Hellier (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1891), p. 301. O. Pfleiderer (Paulinism, p. 119) says: "we have here also, not two co-ordinate causes of salvation, each

We must not make an abstract separation between Christ's death and His resurrection as if the death and the resurrection each had different motives or served ends separate from each other.¹⁰ Christ's work is one and its end one.¹¹ He both died and was raised for our justification. Thus in Romans 4:25 it is mistaken exegesis to separate the two clauses ("put to death for our trespasses" and "raised for our justification") too sharply, as if by His death Christ won remission of sin and by His resurrection justice and holiness.¹² The statement, with its implied distinc-

with its separate effect, but one and the same effect of salvation, which has in the death of Christ its real cause, and in his resurrection the logical ground of the possibility of its subjective appropriation by faith."

¹⁰Cf. K. Barth, The Doctrine of the Word of God, pp. 110 f.; A. Deissmann, The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul (London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1923), p. 237.

¹¹Cf. Bultmann, "New Testament and Mythology," Kerygma and Myth, p. 41, who says: "Indeed, faith in the resurrection is really the same thing as faith in the saving efficacy of the cross, faith in the cross as the cross of Christ."

¹²V. Taylor, The Epistle to the Romans, p. 36; B. Weiss, Biblical Theology of the New Testament, I, p. 104. However see Geerhardus Vos, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Resurrection," The Princeton Theological Review, XXVII (Jan., 1929), p. 16; W. Milligan, The Resurrection of Our Lord, note 59, p. 305; and E. Stauffer, New Testament Theology, p. 136, who express a different view. Vos says [loc. cit.]: "The preposition δι occurring in each of the two clauses, must have, of course, in each the same constructional force; what this force is the first clause shows beyond all possibility of doubt: Christ was delivered up to death 'on account of our trespasses.' . . . If it is to correspond to this, the second clause must mean that He was raised 'on account of our justification.'" Stauffer says [loc. cit.]: ". . . this double proposition from Romans is no pleonastic parallelismus membrorum but a creedal formula . . . whose two parts are precisely distinguished. The first part is retroactive and deals with the cross and the expiation of past sin. The second is prospective and deals with the resurrection and the annulment of future sin."

tion between Jesus as "put to death for our trespasses" and as "raised for our justification," is rhetorical rather than logical in form and must be taken together.¹³ Christ's atoning death does not justify (or redeem) apart from the living Person into union with whom one is brought by faith. The very heart of apostolic Christianity is that we are saved not merely by believing the fact that Christ died for our sins, but by union with the crucified and now living and exalted Lord.

¹³Cf. V. Taylor, Forgiveness and Reconciliation, pp. 42 f.; H. G. Meecham, "Romans iii. 25f., iv. 25--the meaning of $\delta\iota\alpha$ c. acc.," E.T., L, No. 12 (Sept., 1939), p. 564. Gottlob Schrenk, " $\delta\iota\alpha\lambda\upsilon\tau\iota\varsigma$," T.W.N.T., II, p. 228, suggests that the first $\delta\iota\alpha$ relates to cause; the second to purpose. V. Taylor in another reference, "Great Texts Reconsidered," E.T., L., No. 6 (March, 1939), p. 298, says: "The awkwardness of the passage seems due to the semi-quotation of Is. 53:12 in 25a. What he means is that Christ was delivered up and raised because of our sins and our justification."

IV: RISING WITH CHRIST OR PAUL'S MYSTICISM¹

In the intervening period between Jesus' resurrection and His parousia it would not have been unnatural for the disciples to have confined their thoughts to His Messiahship and Lordship and to have been content with looking forward to the future realization of their union with Him in His heavenly glory. Indeed, judging from the speeches in Acts, this attitude seems to have been characteristic of the earliest Apostles--with the exception of Paul. It was the task of the Apostle Paul to deal with one of the immediate problems of the primitive Christian faith--the time interval between the resurrection and return of Christ. Paul's endeavour in this direction has been labelled by the general term "Christ-mysticism," and some believe that the basis of this mysticism was the decline of the Apostle's "futurist eschatology."² In his thoughts of the resurrection of his Lord the Apostle speaks of a present resurrection condition for those belonging to Christ (a "moral" resurrection as some have spoken of it³), which is related to our sanctification, our moral and

¹The author avoids the phrase "the resurrection of the church" because it is quite obviously non-Pauline. Thornton (The Common Life in the Body of Christ, pp. 253-287, esp. pp. 282, 445, 448) employs the term in the sense that when Jesus rose from the dead the church rose with Him. Ernest Best (One Body in Christ, pp. 63 f.) points out that it is wise to avoid the phrase and concludes his thoughts on the matter by saying: "The Church is the place where there is resurrection life; it does not itself rise."

²Cf. C. H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments, p. 149; "The Mind of Paul; Change and Development," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XVIII, No. 1 (Jan., 1934), pp. 27 ff.

³E.g., W. J. Sparrow Simpson, op. cit., pp. 304-311.

spiritual renewal and quickening. Thus it is a mistake to approach Paul's writings with the idea that the resurrection has to do only with the future resurrection of the body after death.

THE POWER OF THE RESURRECTION A PRESENT REALITY

To Paul the resurrection has importance not only for the future life, but is the source of a new life in the present age as well. As Vincent Taylor states, ". . . it [the resurrection] is an eschatological act brought into the present, which has meaning for a man here and now."⁴ From the moment of Jesus' rising, the power of His resurrection was at work upon His disciples, to render them capable of assuming the resurrection mode of existence even before the general resurrection of the dead takes place. The resurrection of the righteous, which traditionally was to precede the inauguration of the new age, has already begun. And though one must wait until the parousia for the bodily resurrection he may experience the power of the resurrection even in the present life. For Paul, Christ is more than an historical personage with whom he can come into contact by meditating upon the words that have been handed down from Him; Christ is a reality and power of the present. It is through this spiritual resurrection that believers become participators in the new age of the kingdom in its present manifestation.

The Apostle's sense of present contact with the Lord was no occa-

⁴Forgiveness and Reconciliation, p. 36.

sional feeling attainable only in rare moments, but was thought of as a permanent possession of the Christian life. What others understood as an extraordinary condition of ecstasy Paul thought of as the enduring condition of Spirit-filled Christians. It was not an ecstasy which he enjoyed from time to time,⁵ but a permanent relation with an unseen Being who was his Master and Lord. In the thought of Deissmann, it was "a glowing fire [rather] than a flickering flame."⁶ This experience is not simply an epiphenomenon of the religious life, but rather the essential condition of belonging to Christ.⁷ Moreover, this relationship does not refer to any pietistic or imaginative absorption of the individual in Christ, but to the facing of the realities of the actual situations of life in His Spirit. Vincent Taylor says, "It is not a 'mystical' relationship involving the loss of personal identity, as when the drop mingles with the ocean, but a fellowship of life in which thoughts, desires, and intentions are mutually shared."⁸ He dwells in Christ and Christ dwells in him.

⁵Paul had been granted such ecstatic moments, but he is aware of the moral and spiritual danger which they involved (II Cor. 12:1-10).

⁶Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History, trans. by William E. Wilson, 2nd ed. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1926), p. 156.

⁷Maurice Goguel, L'Apôtre Paul et Jésus-Christ (Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1904), p. 262.

⁸The Cross of Christ (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1956), p. 40. Cf. Dibelius (Paul, p. 108): "He [Paul] had too much of the Israelite inheritance, and was too much filled with the Old Testament awe to put himself, even for a moment, on the same plane as the Lord of the world. . ."

A Mystical Union

This union of will and purpose between the believer and the Risen Lord has often been described as a "mystical union." Because of a prejudiced dislike and the ambiguity of the phrase one would hesitate to use the term save for the fact that it is the term most frequently used in this connection, and properly understood can facilitate the understanding of Paul's thoughts. The objections to the use of the term arise out of the associations which have gathered around the word "mystical" rather than out of the experience which it describes. To many minds the term connotes a particular type of thought which occurs both in Christianity and elsewhere; it suggests something vague which gives rise to ideas of unreal piety, of sentimentalism, or spiritual ambition, and excited aspirations to extraordinary, ecstatic, and morbid states.⁹ However, Paul's "mysticism" is not something different from his faith. His Christ-mysticism was simply his faith in Christ conceived with peculiar intimacy and fervour.¹⁰

This union, however, is not a privilege reserved for Paul alone.

⁹In speaking of the relation between the ascended body of Christ and His "mystical" body, Dr. J. A. T. Robinson (The Body, p. 52) says: "One could heartily wish that the misleading and un-biblical phrase the 'mystical' body had never been invented."

¹⁰For this reason Deissmann (Paul, p. 135) suggests the alternate terminology, "Christ-intimacy" (Christ-Innigkeit) rather than Christ-mysticism. Cf. pp. 148 f. Cf. also Gwilym O. Griffith, St. Paul's Gospel to the Romans (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1949), pp. 118 ff.; A. Raymond George, Communion With God in the New Testament (London: The Epworth Press, 1953), p. 148. See E. Andrews, op. cit., pp. 84 ff., for a discussion of the question, "Was Paul a mystic?"

He thinks that this union is open to every believer, and to groups of Christians (cf. II Cor. 5:17; Gal. 3:28), and, as is more often the case, to the church as a whole. They live in Him; they are holy in Him, in Him they have their virtues, their sorrows, their joys, and their glory. Their ways are in Christ, in the strength, and grace that are given in Him; in the faith, hope, and charity that are in Him, they advance to the salvation, redemption, and vivification that are in Him. For them, all is in Him, and whether they are being born, or whether they live, or whether they labour, or whether they die, they are always in Christ. Like individuals, particular churches, such as the churches of Judaea, are said to be in Christ.¹¹ Indeed, Paul says that the church as a whole is in Christ (Rom. 12:5).

In Paul's thought about union with Christ he says, "Do you not know that your bodies are members of Christ. . .? (I Cor. 6:15). "Likewise, my brethren, you have died to the law through the body of Christ, so that you may belong to another, to him who has been raised from the dead in order that we may bear fruit for God" (Rom. 7:4). In speaking of the Christian's participation in the resurrection body of Christ, John A. T. Robinson, in his important work, The Body, has pointed out that the Apostle in the above references is referring to the union of the disciples with a person--not to a society; that the term $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ when applied to the church

¹¹Gal. 1:22-- $\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma \epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha\varsigma \tau\eta\varsigma \text{Ιουδαίας} \tau\alpha\iota\varsigma \epsilon\upsilon \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}$. The RSV translators do not make use of the "in Christ" relationship in their translation, "the churches of Christ in Judea." Cf. I Thess. 1:1; 2:14.

conveyed to Paul and his readers something not corporate but something corporal.¹² Dr. Robinson says that the believers are not just "like" Christ's body but are actually complementary members of the resurrection body of Christ.

It is almost impossible to exaggerate the materialism and crudity of Paul's doctrine of the Church as literally now the resurrection body of Christ. The language of 'membership' of a body corporate has become so trite that the idea that the individual can be a 'member' has ceased to be offensive. The force of Paul's words can to-day perhaps be got only by paraphrasing: 'Ye are the body of Christ and severally members thereof' (I Cor. 12:27). The body that he has in mind is as concrete and as singular as the body of the Incarnation. His underlying conception is not of a supra-personal collective, but of a specific personal organism. He is not saying anything so weak as that the Church is a society with a common life and governor, but that its unity is that of a single physical entity; disunion is dismemberment. For it is in fact no other than the glorified body of the risen and ascended Christ.¹³

He goes on to show that the metaphor used in Romans 7:4 is one of sexual union and is used to show that the relation of Christians to Christ is a physical one; they are of "one flesh" (cf. Eph. 5:22-32; I Cor. 6:13-20).

In the same way as no clear distinction can be drawn between the flesh-body of Jesus and the body of His resurrection, so there is no real line between the body of His resurrection and the flesh-bodies of those who are risen with Him; for they are members of it.¹⁴

While one can appreciate this emphasis of the union of believers with the Risen Lord, we join R. F. Hettlinger in questioning Dr. Robinson's virtual identification of the Resurrection Body of Christ and the church. Hettlinger

¹²Pp. 49 ff., The Body.

¹³Ibid., p. 51. Robinson quotes Thornton, op. cit., p. 298, who expressed a similar view.

¹⁴The Body, p. 53.

states: "St. Paul speaks of the Church as growing into the fullness of the Body (Eph. 4.11-16; cf. 2.20-22); but he can hardly mean that the Resurrection of Christ is yet incomplete."¹⁵

Dr. Robinson goes on to say that the resurrection body is made up of many members and as such they form a unity. By their participation in the Body of Christ the powers of the age-to-come are released into the bodies of those who make it up, just as they were in the healing miracles of the incarnate Jesus. Hence the scandal that communicants should be "weak and ill, and some have died" (I Cor. 11:30); they are "guilty of profaning the body and blood of the Lord" (I Cor. 11:27). Paul stresses that the body is for the Lord (I Cor. 6:13); it is meant to be that through which the glory of God is made manifest. The glory of Christ's resurrection body can and must shine out of His members, reflecting the glory of the Lord (II Cor. 3:18; cf. I Cor. 6:13-20; Rom. 3:23; 6:11-13; 12:1). Thus it is that the Apostle appeals to the resurrection as a moving force in the ethical behaviour of the disciples (Rom. 6:4, 5, 11-13). Paul's eager expectation and hope is that "now as always Christ will be honored in my body, whether by life or by death" (Phil. 1:20).¹⁶

¹⁵"2 Corinthians 5.1-10," S.J.T., X, No. 2 (June, 1957), p. 188, note 3. C. F. D. Moule, in his review of Robinson's work, The Body, says: "Dr. Robinson's denial of $\tau\acute{o}\nu\omega\varsigma$ as a term of individuality (p. 12 No. 1) is possibly too sweeping: we ought, perhaps, to have it both ways." See J.T.S., IV (1953), pp. 74 f.

¹⁶The Body, cf. pp. 54 ff., 73 f.

Significance of the Phrase "In Christ"

The most characteristic expression used by the Apostle to describe this relationship to the Risen Christ is the term "in Christ" or "in the Lord." The emphasis on the mystical element in Paul's teaching and the importance of the expression "in Christ" date from the publication of Adolf Deissmann's significant pamphlet, Die neutestamentliche Formel 'in Christo Jesu',¹⁷ in which he states that the phrase "in Christ" or "in the Lord" is used 164 times.¹⁸ The expression is not capable of a certain and demonstrable explanation as it does not always convey one and the same meaning. It appears to be a kind of shorthand which Paul coined to express his conception of faith in Christ. As a Christian he is in Christ, or, what comes to the same thing, he has Christ dwelling in him. Only where this is actually the case as a fact of experience is true faith present, as is evident from II Corinthians 13:5: "Examine yourselves, to see whether you are holding to your faith. Test yourselves. Do you not realize that Jesus Christ is in you?" And the same is expressed negatively

¹⁷Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche, 1892.

¹⁸He excludes Colossians, Ephesians, and the Pastoral Epistles as non-genuine Pauline epistles. Otherwise the phrase "in Christ" occurs nearly 240 times in the epistles. For a thorough exposition of the phrase "in Christ" see Ernest Best, op. cit., pp. 1-33, et passim; J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, II, pp. 468 f., note 22; Emile Mersch, The Whole Christ, pp. 106 ff.; Rawlinson, The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ, pp. 155-160; A. Deissmann, Paul, pp. 135 ff.; Albrecht Cepke, "ἐν," T.W.N.T., II (1935), pp. 537-539; V. Taylor, Forgiveness and Reconciliation, pp. 113-116; Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, pp. 311-12, 327-329; and Friedrich Büchsel, "'In Christus' bei Paulus," Z.N.T.W., XLII (1949), pp. 141-158.

in Romans 8:9: "But you are not in the flesh, you are in the Spirit, if the Spirit of God really dwells in you. Any one who does not have the Spirit of Christ does not belong to him." This characteristically Pauline expression, to be "in Christ," means the same as to be in a condition of being filled, seized on, possessed, by a higher spiritual being.

The believer feels himself bound up with his Saviour in the closest union of life to a personal Being. This mystical union and self-identification with Christ is a significant peculiarity in Paul's conception of faith.¹⁹ It denotes the most intimate conceivable communion between the disciple and the Risen Lord. Professor J. S. Stewart says: "The heart of Paul's religion is union with Christ. This more than any other conception--more than justification, more than sanctification, more even than reconciliation--is the key which unlocks the secrets of his soul."²⁰ In this unreserved, self-forgetting surrender of the whole self to the Saviour the believer feels himself to be a new creature. The old ego with its

¹⁹Cf. Anton Fridrichsen, "Jesus, St John and St Paul," The Root of the Vine, p. 42: "It is not true that the Pauline 'in Christ' is absolutely new, originating in the personal experience of the Apostle. Rather, the believer's relation to Christ, as St Paul understands it, is the fulfilment of Jesus's teaching about discipleship, made possible by the resurrection, and expressed in terms of it; though St Paul's teaching naturally bears the stamp of his own religious individuality."

²⁰A Man In Christ, p. 147. Cf. Jean Héring, Le Royaume de Dieu et sa venue: Étude sur L'espérance de Jésus et de L'apôtre Paul (Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan, 1937), p. 223, who says: "L'expérience mystique de l'union avec le Christ ou avec le $\pi\upsilon\lambda\acute{o}\mu\alpha\lambda\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ (qui opère les miracles à l'intérieur et à l'extérieur de l'Homme) est bien le rocher de bronze de la religion paulinienne, comme le cogito dans la philosophie de Descartes."

inner disharmony, its vacillation between defiance and apprehension, between selfish disobedience and slavish fear, has disappeared, and a new ego has come to life, in which selfless, trustful love has become the ruling affection, the centre of the personal life, and the springboard of all moral effort. The ideals of the Son of God have been received and have become in the immediate experience the power of a life of sonship to God. "I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me; and the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me."²¹ No identity with Christ is claimed, nor does this union exclude distinction between the believer and Christ; but there is a dependence, an intimacy, and a submission that constitutes a genuine union. It is the closest possible fellowship between two persons who remain distinct individuals. In this thought Paul has given the authentic explanation of what faith in Christ, in the full sense, means to him: it is the mystic union with Christ, the surrender of the whole ego to Christ to be made one in life with Him.²²

THE RELATION OF BAPTISM TO RISING WITH CHRIST

Paul asks his readers: "Do you not know that all of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death?" (Rom. 6:3).

²¹Gal. 2:20. Cf. II Cor. 5:17.

²²O. Pfleiderer, Primitive Christianity, I, pp. 347 f.

The language of this verse indicates that Paul refers to matters well known to his readers. Through union with Christ by faith, and by baptism, they are "crucified with Christ" (Gal. 2:20) and "united [$\tau\acute{\upsilon}\mu\varphi\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota$] with him in a death like his" (Rom. 6:5). This is not a dying in the biological sense, but a dying to that false ego which is identical with sin. Only in proportion as the dying forces of the believer decay can his natural capacities be absorbed and utilized by the higher power of Christ.²³

The disciple becomes one with Christ as the graft becomes one with the tree into which it grows. Thus we see that Paul speaks not only of "dying with Christ," but also of being "buried with him" (Rom. 6:4). Professor J. S. Stewart comments upon this verse and says that "Paul employs the image of burial to put the reality of the death to sin beyond dispute."²⁴

This dying to sin and being buried with Christ are to be understood in connection with baptism. The idea of death and burial naturally suggested an analogy with immersion into the waters of baptism.²⁵ When the candidate

²³Cf. R. H. J. Steuart, "The Resurrection," *op. cit.*, p. 110, who says: "Every uprising from sin, every recovery of failing faith or hope or charity, every impulse to better things and higher ideals, is the Resurrection of Christ within us."

²⁴A Man In Christ, p. 191.

²⁵In this connection Cullmann, "The Kingship of Christ and the Church in the New Testament," The Early Church, p. 118, says: "And it is significant that baptism, the sacrament of reception into the Church, was first instituted by Christ after his resurrection." Cf. William Stählin, The Mystery of God, trans. by R. Birch Hoyle (London: S.C.M. Press, 1937), pp. 94 f.; A. J. B. Higgins, "The Growth of New Testament Theology," S.J.T., VI, No. 3 (Sept., 1953), p. 282; Anders Nygren, The Gospel of God, trans. by L. J. Trinterud (London: S.C.M. Press, Ltd., 1951), pp. 70 ff.

for baptism was immersed into the baptismal waters he was symbolically drowned and buried, and thus the baptismal rite was a symbol of the death and burial of Jesus. Hence Christ's death was for Paul not merely a fact of the past, but a reality of the present as well. But by this dying with Christ the Apostle did not mean an emotional participation in a sacred drama, like that enacted in honour of the gods of the mystery cults. Christ was not, like these gods, the pathetic victim of fate; He had been obedient unto death, and the effect of His self-dedication was shown, not in the mystic rapture of His devotees, but in their freedom from bondage to sin, and their share in the power of His risen life (Rom. 6:2-9).²⁶

In the mind of the Apostle, when the believer is buried with Christ in baptism he likewise rises with Christ to walk in newness of life. Dr. Robinson says:

The resurrection of the body starts at baptism, when a Christian becomes 'one Spirit' (i. e., one spiritual body) with the Lord (I Cor. 6.17), and 'puts on (the body of) Christ' (Gal. 3.27), 'the new man', which 'hath been created' (Eph. 4.24) and 'is being renewed . . . after the image of him that created him' (Col. 3.10). Baptism begins the substitution of the solidarity of one body by that of another (cf. Rom. 6.3,6,12).²⁷

The habit of treating I Cor. 15 in isolation from the rest of Paul's writing has tended to obscure its connection with the very much larger

²⁶Sydney Cave, The Gospel of St. Paul (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1928), p. 59.

²⁷The Body, pp. 79 f. He explains, of course, that there is nothing automatic about baptism; rather baptism places a man within the sphere where grace is operative. Cf. W. Robinson, "'The First Resurrection' and 'the Second Death' in the Apocalypse," Theology, XLVI, No. 275 (May, 1943), pp. 97-102. W. Robinson thinks that this dying and rising with Christ at baptism is what the author of the Apocalypse has in mind when he speaks of "the first death" and "the first resurrection" (Rev. 20:5, 6).

number of passages which depict this gradual transformation and glorification of the body from baptism onwards. The result is that the final change has become mistakenly conceived as quasi-magical and unrelated to anything that has gone before.²⁸

The truth of Dr. Robinson's statements is seen in several of Paul's epistles. "If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ Jesus from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through his Spirit which dwells in you" (Rom. 8:11). "But God, who is rich in mercy, out of the great love with which he loved us . . . made us alive together with Christ . . . and raised us up with him, and made us sit with him in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus . . ." (Eph. 2:4-6). ". . . And you were buried with him in baptism, in which you were also raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead" (Col. 2:12). "If then you have been raised with Christ, seek the things that are above . . ." (Col. 3:1). Indeed as Professor Rengstorff has said, "Der Realismus des Mitsterbens fordert den Realismus auch des Mitaufstehens."²⁹

THE RELATION OF THE PRESENT RESURRECTION OF BELIEVERS WITH CHRIST'S RESURRECTION

The resurrection of Jesus is not an independent event in that Paul

²⁸The Body, p. 81.

²⁹Die Auferstehung Jesu, p. 49. For a discussion of the relation of the Lord's Supper to the resurrection, vide supra, pp. 114 ff.

thinks of Jesus' resurrection and that of believers as being linked together. Though temporally separated they must be regarded as a unity. The disciples were risen-along-with Christ, even though they still have the external appearance of natural men.³⁰

This rising with Christ is a manifestation of "the power of his resurrection" (Phil. 3:10), or of the same mighty power of God which had effected Christ's resurrection and enthronement in the heavenly places. As Christ was raised according to the working of the Father (Eph. 1:19), even so ". . . you he made alive, when you were dead through the trespasses and sin" (Eph. 2:1; cf. II Cor. 4:14). The resurrection energy of God in raising Christ and in raising us when we were dead in trespasses and sins is one and the same. Dr. Albert Schweitzer says:

The fundamental significance of the dying and rising again of Jesus consists therefore, according to Paul, in the fact that thereby death and resurrection have been set afoot throughout the whole corporeity of the Elect to the Messianic Kingdom. That is, so to speak, a mass of piled-up fuel, to which the fire there kindled immediately spreads. But whereas this dying and rising again has been openly manifested in Jesus, in the Elect it goes forward secretly but none the less really. Since in the nature of their corporeity they are now assimilated to Jesus Christ, they become, through His death and resurrection, beings in whom dying and rising again have already begun, although the outward seeming of their natural existence remains unchanged.³¹

³⁰ Cf. Albert Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, trans. by William Montgomery, 2nd ed. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1953), p. 111. On Schweitzer's views of Paul's mysticism (in particular, Schweitzer's view of the union of the Elect with Christ) see E. Andrews, op. cit., p. 110 et passim. Andrews thinks that Schweitzer's "quasi-physical conception" of "union with Christ" is untenable.

³¹ The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p. 110. Cf. A. D. Müller, Religion und Alltag, 4th ed. (Berlin Furche Verlag, 1932), p. 213, who says: "Therefore it is the Resurrection that all human heroism is first shown the way of fulfilment. It is in inner connection with the Risen One that man first gains the ability to put himself in opposition to the whole

The one act is the prolongation of the other, the continued manifestation of the same act of God.

Having been united and risen with Christ the believer has eternal life. The life in the Spirit upon which he has entered is everlasting and not even physical death can interrupt it. The instrument through whom God effects this present resurrection is the same instrument that God used to bring about the resurrection of Christ--i. e. the Spirit. On the one hand the Spirit is the resurrection-source, and on the other He appears as the permanent substratum of the resurrection-life, to which He supplies the inner, basic element and the outer atmosphere.³² The being unto death has already been changed into a being unto life, and though one may experience physical death,³³ he does not die into nothingness, but unto Christ. Hence, as Dr. Schweitzer has pointed out, "at the return of Christ those who are alive do not need first to die in order to enter on the resurrection state of existence, but, as having already died and risen again with Christ, can enter on it by a simple transformation, that is by sloughing off the natural existence which clings to them as a sort of outer covering."³⁴

world, to strip off all fear of human persecution, and to pass over to the side of Light, in the Yea of the divine decision. For them he has put on the 'armor of God.'" (As cited by Arseniev, We Beheld His Glory, p. 69.)

³²Vide supra the discussion of the Holy Spirit, pp. 180 ff.

³³The final transformation of the body is an event which must wait upon the parousia, and until that time those who possess the firstfruits of the Spirit "groan inwardly" (Rom. 8:23). Nevertheless, the disciples have the "promised Holy Spirit, which is the guarantee of our inheritance until we acquire possession of it . . ." (Eph. 1:13 f.; cf. Rom. 8:11).

³⁴The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p. 111. Cf. P. Hadfield, "The

The future resurrection of the body is the natural sequence of one's resurrection with Christ to the new life in the Spirit here on earth.³⁵

This dying and rising again with Christ not only has significance for our relationship to our Lord but has profound importance because of the new fellowship which exists between one believer and another. By virtue of being in the Risen Christ one disciple becomes a "brother" (ἀδελφός) to all those who are also with him in Christ (cf. Phil. 1:14; Col. 1:2; Philemon 16). This word "brother" testifies to the closeness of one believer to another--they were members of the same family and have the same Father.³⁶ The distinctions of class disappear (Gal. 5:6), and though some were in Christ before others (cf. "Andronicus and Junias . . . they were in Christ before me"--Rom. 16:10), they were of the same family. 7

THE ORIGIN OF PAUL'S MYSTICISM

There have been various interpretations of the origin of the Apostle's Christ-mysticism. The attempt has been made by Bultmann, Reitzenstein, and

Resurrection Body." The Church Quarterly Review, CLVIII, No. 328 (July-Sept., 1957), p. 303.

³⁵The error condemned in II Tim. 2:18, that "the resurrection is past already" (apparently without any expectation of a future resurrection), was probably a perversion of this teaching of a present resurrection.

The author is indebted to Dr. J. A. T. Robinson, The Body, for many of the thoughts presented above.

³⁶There are no other words to suggest a closer relationship except possibly the words describing marriage, and these are normally retained for another purpose, viz., the relationship of the Lord to His people.

Bousset to prove that here Paul is manifestly influenced by the mystery religions.³⁷ They would hold that just as devotees in certain popular Gentile cults realized a union with their lord when they experienced the initiation ceremonies and became full-fledged members of the society, so Paul held out to the Gentiles the promise of a similar experience of union with the Risen Christ. It is not necessary to go into detail as to the theories of such scholars, nor in a lengthy rebuttal of their arguments. W. D. Davies and others³⁸ have adequately appraised their views and have shown that on several grounds these interpreters have failed to substantiate their arguments:

First, the sources to which appeal has been made are of a late date, and our ignorance of the actual nature of the ceremonies performed in the mysteries makes any comparison with Christian practice precarious. Secondly, there is the almost complete silence of Christian writers to the end of the second century on the question of the mysteries. Thirdly, there are lacking in the mysteries certain elements that are fundamental to Paul's view of dying and rising with Christ. . . . The latter's [Paul's] interest in the Jesus of history excludes the idea that Jesus was for him merely the counterpart of what Osiris and Attis and the other gods were to their devotees. . . . His union with Christ was for Paul no absorption into the divine such as is fundamental to the mystery religions. Nor was it by any celebration of outward rites such as Baptism or the Eucharist that the dying and rising with Christ was achieved. . . .

³⁷Cf. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, pp. 139 ff.; Reitzenstein, "Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Paulus," Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, dritte auflage (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1927), pp. 417-425; Bousset, Kyrios Christos, pp. 113 ff.

³⁸Cf. H. A. A. Kennedy, St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1913), pp. 225-228; Boylan, Romans, pp. 101 f.; Schweitzer, Paul and His Interpreters, pp. 225 f.; H. G. Marsh, The Origin and Significance of the New Testament Baptism (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1941), pp. 139 ff.

Finally, the attempt to show that much of Paul's language is derived directly from the mysteries has not been successful.³⁹

Influence of the Early Church

While several scholars have agreed that the mystery religions are not the source of Paul's thought, fewer have offered positive suggestions as to the probable source. H. G. Marsh thinks that Paul was most likely influenced by the early church's teaching of the gift of the Spirit in baptism.⁴⁰ He states:

We may regard it [Paul's mysticism] as the outcome of the doctrine of the gift of the Spirit in baptism which was accepted throughout the early Christian communities, and which, in the case of Paul, had been transmuted in the crucible of his own personal experience.⁴¹

Thus Marsh suggests that Paul's doctrine of union with Christ is the Apostle's contribution to the baptismal teaching of the early church. Whether this is the case or not, it does seem reasonable to think that the Apostle was influenced in some capacity by the early church in this connection. In his mysticism Paul employs ideas similar to those expressed by his Lord in the Fourth Gospel when Jesus used the familiar allegory of the vine and the branches (15:1 ff.). Again Jesus speaks of Himself as the "living bread" of which "a man may eat of it and not die" (John 6:50). Jesus seems to indicate that the future resurrection is dependent upon a present participation in His life: "Truly, truly, I say to you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink of his blood, you have no life

³⁹Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, cf. pp. 89-98.

⁴⁰Op. cit., pp. 139 ff.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 142.

in you; he who eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day" (6:53, 54). That which is represented in the Eucharist by the act of eating the bread and drinking the wine is that the believer in Christ, as Jesus says (vs. 56), "abides in me, and I in him."⁴² Paul's mysticism thus seems to be in keeping with these concepts of Jesus that the resurrection of the dead has its life-centre in the present Christian experience.

Paul's Personal Experience

William E. Wilson in his article on "The Development of Paul's Doctrine of Dying and Rising again with Christ" thinks that Paul's own experience gave him this conception of mysticism.⁴³ He points out that while this idea occurs in some of Paul's later writings (Romans and Colossians), it is not found in the Apostle's earlier letters (I and II Thess. and I Cor.).⁴⁴ despite the fact that one would expect the Apostle to have mentioned it in his two parallels of the resurrection of Christ with the future resurrection of believers (I Cor. 6:14; 15:22).⁴⁵ In neither of these passages is there any suggestion of a present experience. In Romans and Colossians Mr. Wilson believes that the conception takes on

⁴²Vide supra pp. 114 ff. where the significance of the Lord's Supper in connection with the resurrection is discussed.

⁴³E.T., XLII, No. 12 (Sept., 1931), pp. 562-565.

⁴⁴However, as we have seen above, it seems that already in Galatians there are indications of Paul's mysticism--cf. Gal. 2:20; 3:27,28; 5:6.

⁴⁵"The Development of Paul's Doctrine of Dying and Rising again with Christ," op. cit., p. 563.

the definite form of teaching which was thoroughly familiar to the Apostle himself, and possibly to his readers.

It is something that his mind has worked upon, which now, therefore, has attained to a recognized mode of expression. . . . It seems, then, not impossible that it first formed itself in Paul's mind between the time when he wrote I Co., perhaps about the middle of his stay in Ephesus (see Ac. 19), and the time when he wrote Ro. just before setting out for Jerusalem. This hypothesis is confirmed by the fact that the conception appears in 2 Co. in what seems to me a more undeveloped form. Chapters 4 and 5 of this Epistle are filled with the Apostle's personal experience. . . . When these [vss. 10 and 14 of II Cor. 4] are read in their context, in which Paul lays stress upon the troubles through which he is passing, and sees opening out before him a higher, more spiritual life than he has hitherto known, the conclusion is strongly suggested that the true source of this doctrine is not the Mystery Religions (though, of course, he may have known something about them, and that knowledge may almost unconsciously have influenced him), but a definite, concrete experience of mortal distress and vital succour, throughout which he had known the presence of Christ in peculiar strength and vividness.⁴⁶

Granting the validity of this argument that "mortal distress" played a significant rôle in the development of Paul's mysticism, we must not overlook the earlier significance of Paul's conversion experience. This Damascus experience with the Risen One revealed to Paul the grace of Christ which caused his conversion and became the ground of his theological development. Without this contact with the living and Risen Christ, he could never have experienced the close relationship which afterwards became so central to his thought.⁴⁷

⁴⁶Ibid., pp. 563 f.

⁴⁷Cf. Elias Andrews, The Meaning of Christ For Paul, pp. 83 f., 86, 88-91.

V: CONCLUSION

Besides its Christological significance, the resurrection of Jesus assumes soteriological importance as well. The resurrection was, to be sure, God's seal and reward of Christ's life and work on earth--the Father's confirmation of the truth of His Son's claims. But far too often, in the minds of many, this meaning has been the extent of importance of the resurrection. To limit the significance of this great act of God to this external rôle is to rob the resurrection of its essential meaning as an integral part of Jesus' redemptive revelation. The apostles thought of the resurrection of Christ not merely as something added on to their Lord's life and work on earth, but rather as an essential part of Jesus' redemptive work, necessary to its culmination and completion. This is true because it is only through His resurrection and exaltation that Christ entered fully into the life of supreme power and sovereignty (cf. Eph. 1:20 ff.), and was thus able to become the life-giving agent of a new humanity (cf. I Cor. 15:45). This new status enabled the Risen Christ to continue His past ministry, but to continue it without the obstacles of His earthly ministry and in a far greater capacity.

The post-resurrection ministry of the Lord is seen first of all in the fact that it is the risen, exalted and reigning Christ who sends the Holy Spirit. The Spirit works in relation to the Risen Christ, to witness to Him, to interpret and to glorify Him. The Spirit, as the substratum of the resurrection life, is at work in the believer to constitute the spiritual

body of Christ. The Spirit is the anticipation and assurance of the final and supreme revelation. The resurrection is necessary for our justification because the resurrection not only certifies the atoning efficacy of Jesus' death but it is only through Christ's rising again that justification becomes an accomplished fact and effective reality. His rising again was the necessary antecedent of His applying to His disciples the virtues of the atonement which His death had made possible.

His rising makes possible a new life-principle for the believer, and though one must wait until the parousia for the bodily resurrection, he may experience the power of the resurrection even in the present life. In baptism the believer dies with Christ, is united with Him, and being "in Christ," he rises with Him and becomes one with the Risen Lord. This union with Christ is further seen in the Lord's Supper, which in the main looks back to the post-resurrection Meals which the Risen Lord shared with His disciples. It is through the present rising with Christ that the believer becomes participator in the new age.

From our survey it is seen that the resurrection of Jesus assumes greater significance from the soteriological point of view in the Apostle Paul's writings than in any of the other New Testament documents. While there still survived the teachings of the earlier disciples, Paul enriched and developed that which he had received.

PART IV

BILL STONE

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESURRECTION

ESTHER STRONG

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESURRECTION

I: INTRODUCTION

In the Apostle Paul's writings we do not find an elaborated system of eschatology. Though his epistles come nearer to a systematic statement than any of the other New Testament writings, the Apostle at no time attempts to formulate a systematic eschatology [such] as we usually think of it. He deals with eschatology primarily in those situations in churches where difficulties and misunderstandings had arisen among his fellow believers. Yet, as we shall see, it can be shown that his writings contain the basic elements of a full eschatology. Paul's thoughts on the future are not isolated nor treated as a kind of addendum to the body of his doctrine. Rather, such thoughts condition and dominate his theology throughout--from the earliest to the last of his epistles.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESURRECTION FOR ESCHATOLOGY

In all the Apostle's thoughts of the future, no doctrine plays a more significant rôle than that of the resurrection. The assurance of eternal life is of fundamental importance to his faith. Without this hope his faith would not only be lacking something, but, in truth, it would be in vain and cease to exist. Indeed the key word of Paul's eschatology (as well as that of the New Testament as a whole) is "resurrection." Westcott pointed out that the resurrection is no isolated event in history, but is "the climax

of a long series of Divine dispensations which find in it [the resurrection] their complement and explanation."¹ As Emil Brunner writes:

The Resurrection is the telos, the goal and the meaning of the life of Christ. As in a game, the thrower's aim is that the missile should hit the mark, apart from which it would be altogether valueless, or as the meaning of an address finally consists in this, that what ought to be said is said, so the Resurrection is the meaning of the coming of Jesus Christ. The whole revelation is eschatological. This is the mystery of the divine purpose, the 'end of the ways of God'; eternal glory, the life everlasting.²

The resurrection as the telos of the life of Christ (assuming the above) was now an accomplished fact and it set in motion an integral aspect of the last things--the resurrection of those who died in Christ.

To the earlier disciples the resurrection meant a miraculous act of God whereby He vindicated and exalted His Son. Jesus' resurrection was not regarded so much as the basis of eternal life as it was the necessary means of Jesus' glorification, ascension, and the advent of His Messiahship in power.³ To the Apostle it is clearly and outspokenly the sign vouchsafed by God of the ultimate victory over death. While he is ever mindful of the present significance of the resurrection, as we have seen, his

¹The Gospel of the Resurrection, p. 113.

²The Mediator, pp. 579 f. Cf. Brunner, The Scandal of Christianity (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1951), pp. 106 f.

³However in Acts 4:2 we learn that the disciples were "proclaiming in Jesus the resurrection from the dead." This preaching was probably directed against the Sadducean disbelief in the resurrection. Also, in thinking of the significance of the resurrection for Jesus, Peter refers to Christ as the "Author of life" (3:15) and as "Leader and Savior" (5:31). Vide supra pp. 147 f., note 16. While there can be no doubt that from the very beginning the resurrection of Jesus had both Christological and eschatological significance, the early preaching left room for Paul's development and enrichment.

interest is with this eschatological significance par excellence.⁴ In this sense the resurrection must be viewed as an eschatological sign or symbol in history of the ultimate consummation of God's purpose--the final triumph of God in the overcoming of death.

⁴Cf. Bultmann, "New Testament and Mythology," Kerygma and Myth, p. 40; Theology of the New Testament, I, pp. 81 f. While Bultmann does not hold to the resurrection as an objective event which once happened, one can appreciate his positive emphasis on the resurrection from the standpoint of an "existential-historical" or eschatological event. See John MacQuarrie, An Existentialist Theology: A Comparison of Heidegger and Bultmann (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1955), pp. 186 ff.

II: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST

AND THAT OF BELIEVERS

The final resurrection brings to completion that order of resurrection which began with Christ's rising from the dead. It is the natural fulfilment of the resurrection which Paul, as well as other Christians, had already experienced through their mystical union with Christ. This is seen first of all in that Christ's resurrection is the first-fruit of the harvest (I Cor. 15:20, 23; Col. 1:18). Secondly, we see that the same Spirit which raised Christ is to raise His disciples (Rom. 8:11).

CHRIST THE FIRST-FRUIT OF THE RESURRECTION

Those people⁵ who were raised during the ministry of Jesus were not really first harvestings of the general resurrection because they presumably died again. They were thought of as having resumed for a time their preceding life, not as having radically triumphed over death. To them the resurrection was only the granting of a short spell more of earthly existence, which death, at last, would end.⁶ To designate the Risen Lord as ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν means that the resurrection of those who belong to Him will follow. Benjamin

⁵ Lazarus, Jairus' daughter, the young man of Nain (Luke 7:11 ff.), the saints at the time of Jesus' crucifixion (Matt. 27:52-53), and the later case by Peter (Tabitha, Acts 9:36 ff.).

⁶ Cf. Theodore Wood, The Second Adam or How Does Christ's Humanity Affect Our Own (London: Skeffington & Son, 1912), pp. 167 f.

W. Bacon says that the reference to Christ as the "firstfruits of them that slept" is not only suggested by, but based upon, the Jewish ritual of the feast of Unleavened Bread. "'Firstfruits,' with its ritual of the lifting up before God of the first sheaf of the new crop marked the beginning, as Pentecost marked the close, of the seven festal weeks of wheat-harvest."⁷ The metaphor implies subsequent births or more fruits to come from the same source, and suggests the certainty of a final harvest.⁸ To Paul the resurrection of Jesus would be merely a "story" if we were not to know its benefits for ourselves. As the death of the first Adam was typical of the fate that awaited all men, so the resurrection of the Last Adam was prophetic of the believer's future hope. His resurrection signifies that He broke through death which is also our death--His Easter is our Easter.

Brunner rightfully comments:

For Jesus Christ is no private individual, and His destiny is not a private affair. He is indeed the Mediator. Since He Himself goes through

⁷"The Resurrection in Primitive Tradition and Observance," The American Journal of Theology, XV, No. 3 (July, 1911), p. 392.

⁸Rom. 8:23. Cf. J. Weiss, Der erste Korintherbrief, p. 356. Johs. Pedersen, Israel: Its Life and Culture, Vol. III-IV (London: Oxford University Press, 1940), p. 301, states: "... As the first of the produce they [the first fruits] represent the whole; the entire power and blessedness of the harvest are concentrated in them. Hence the first-fruits have a special possibility of being holy and acting by their holiness on the growth of the rest of the produce." The figure is taken from the ceremony of the Law described in Lev. 23:10-12. See Wm. Milligan, The Resurrection of the Dead (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1894), pp. 43 f., for more about the ceremony and its connection with Jesus' rising on Sunday. This thought of Jesus as the first-fruit is given further illumination in Rom. 8:29 where Christ is referred to as the "first-born [$\pi\rho\omega\tau\acute{o}\tau\omicron\kappa\omicron\varsigma$] among many brethren." Both $\pi\rho\omega\tau\acute{o}\tau\omicron\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ and $\alpha\pi\alpha\rho\chi\eta$ refer to the new humanity which began with Christ's resurrection (vide supra, pp. 146 ff.), and both concepts are

death, He carries off humanity as His spoil with Himself, that is, those who through faith become His own, who through election are His. Through His Resurrection alone we are translated "out of the Kingdom of darkness into the Kingdom of His dear Son." That only through belief in the Resurrection did the Church, historically, come into being is only the historical reflection of the fact that it is based only on the resurrection in Christ.⁹

This truth is seen in Romans 6:5-11 where Paul points out the present spiritual resurrection to new life in Christ, and he is careful to preface his thoughts about the present resurrection with the assurance that his readers will be raised with Christ: "So you also must consider yourselves . . . alive to God in Christ Jesus" (vs. 11); and "we shall certainly be united with him in a resurrection like his" (vs. 5). Dr. C. H. Dodd points out that Paul usually refers to the present experience of Christians as in Christ and their future state as with Christ.¹⁰ Deissmann stated the same thought in saying that the phrase "with Christ" denotes a higher stage of being "in Christ," and that the former is the eschatological expression of the present mystical experience of being "in Christ."¹¹ Cullmann points

related in thought with the future resurrection of believers. Cf. V. Taylor, The Names of Jesus, pp. 147 ff.

⁹The Mediator, p. 582. Cf. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p. 112. Karl Heim, The Church of Christ and the Problems of the Day (London: Nisbet and Co. Ltd., 1936), p. 157, says: "Just as when a dyke in the Low Countries on the shores of the North Sea gives way, even if it is only one little section, we know that, although this is in itself an event of small importance, the consequences are inestimable. Beyond the dyke is the tumultuous sea, which will burst through the opening. So Paul knew, when he had met the Risen One, that 'he is the first-born of them that slept' (I Cor. 15:20)."

¹⁰The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, p. 89. Cf. I Thess. 4:17; Phil. 1:23.

¹¹The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, p. 176.

out:

Resurrection ceases to be only an object of hope; it is faith, and in particular faith in a fact, the resurrection of Christ, which has already occurred at the mid-point of time. It is no longer possible to say, "We shall arise," without saying at the same time, "Christ has risen!" This is the new thing in the resurrection in the New Testament. The resurrection is no longer spoken of merely in the future tense, but also in the past . . . this means that death is already conquered (Acts 2:24). If it was not able to hold in its power the one man, then its power over men is broken. Even if the others must still die, yet the omnipotence of death over men is once for all ended, since there is one man who "has taken from death its power" (II Tim. 1:10).¹² . . . Resurrection is no longer a vague apocalyptic theme of discussion between Pharisees and Sadducees. From now on it is not only the Sadducee rejection of the resurrection that is to be denied, but also the Pharisaic affirmation of the resurrection, if it does not proceed from the already occurred resurrection of Christ. All hope of individual resurrection now receives a concrete foundation in this fact of the past (Acts 17:31).¹³

Thus the future resurrection of believers is intelligible only on the basis of the faith in the already realized resurrection of Christ and the belief in the present working power of the resurrection.

ACTIVITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

The analogy between the resurrection of Jesus and that of believers is further strengthened by the fact that both are dependent on the activity of the Holy Spirit (which is already present in the believers): "If the

¹²Cullmann (Christ and Time, p. 153) points out that "In II Tim. 1:10 the same verb, *καταργέω* ("render inactive," "abolish"), that Paul uses in I Cor. 15:25 to designate the future final annihilation of death as the last of these enemies, is used to describe the victory over death as already accomplished through Christ's death and resurrection."

¹³Ibid., pp. 234 f.

Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ Jesus from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through his Spirit which dwells in you" (Rom. 8:11). In considering this verse (the latter part of the verse in particular), whether one accepts the generally preferred reading (διὰ τοῦ ἐνδοκίου τοῦ αὐτοῦ πνεύματος) or the accusative (διὰ τὸ ἐνδοκίον αὐτοῦ πνεύμα), the fact that the Spirit works instrumentally in the resurrection is clearly implied.

G. Vos has said that the accusative reading implies "the further idea of the Spirit as the permanent basis of the resurrection-state,"¹⁴ or as Neill Q. Hamilton has more recently stated in expressing the same thought: "there is the added thought that the Spirit not only initiates the resurrection but also sustains in their resurrection the life of the redeemed."¹⁵ Elsewhere the resurrection of Christ is ascribed to the Spirit indirectly, being thought of as an act of the *δύναμις* or the *δόξα* of God; for example, Rom. 6:4, I Cor. 6:12, II Cor. 13:4. Vos states that "this *δόξα* is so closely allied to the Spirit as to become almost a synonym for it. Thus, as God the Father is said to have raised Christ διὰ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, believers are said to be transformed ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν i. e., from the glory they behold in (or reflect from) Christ unto the glory they

¹⁴"The Eschatological Aspect of the Pauline Conception of the Spirit," Biblical and Theological Studies, p. 206.

¹⁵Op. cit., p. 19. Hamilton thinks that here in Rom. 8:11 the Apostle had in mind Ezek. 37:14 which he says was recognized in late Judaism as being of continuing eschatological importance. In his article Hamilton seeks to prove that the activity of the Spirit belongs properly to the future and that it is understandable only as a property of the future age.

receive in themselves, 2 Cor. iii.18."¹⁶

The Holy Spirit was the active agent in the resurrection of Christ, and the present possession of the Spirit is the assurance of the future resurrection of the dead: "He who has prepared us for this very thing [our heavenly dwelling] is God, who has given us the Spirit as a guarantee" ($\acute{\alpha}\pi\pi\alpha\ \beta\acute{\omega}\nu$, II Cor. 5:5). II Corinthians 1:22 uses the same term $\acute{\alpha}\pi\pi\alpha\ \beta\acute{\omega}\nu$, to show that the Spirit is our assurance that God's promises (vs. 20) will be fulfilled. In Ephesians 1:14 the term is again used in an eschatological context to show that the Spirit is "the guarantee of our inheritance until we acquire possession of it." These references to the Spirit, in connection with $\acute{\alpha}\pi\pi\alpha\ \beta\acute{\omega}\nu$, bring us to the heart of Paul's conception of the Spirit and show that his thoughts of the Spirit pertained largely to the future.¹⁷

¹⁶"The Eschatological Aspect of the Pauline Conception of the Spirit," op. cit., p. 234.

¹⁷Hamilton, op. cit., p. 20. Cf. William H. P. Hatch, "The Holy Spirit in St. Paul," Paulus-Hellas-Oikumene: An Ecumenical Symposium (Athens: The Students Christian Association of Greece, 1951), p. 159.

III: THE NATURE OF THE RESURRECTION BODY

Paul does not discuss at length the relationship or contrast between Christ's resurrection body and that of believers in general. Of course there is the obvious difference in that Christ's earthly body did not see the corruption, or extent of corruption, that the bodies of believers experienced and still experience (cf. Acts 2:31; 13:34 ff.).¹⁸ But for the Apostle this was of no significance, and in the final analysis one can rest assured that for Paul there was no vital difference between the nature of the two, any more than there will be any difference between that of those who are dead and those who will be alive at the parousia.

THE RESURRECTION BODY OF BELIEVERS PATTERNED AFTER THAT OF CHRIST

In Romans 6:5 Paul states: "We shall certainly be united with him in a resurrection like his." This verse would certainly give us a clue as to the Pauline concept of the nature of the future resurrection body--it is to be a bodily resurrection like that of the Lord. It was to be a bodily resurrection, yet "it was a body of a wholly new and different nature from that which died and was buried--as different as heaven from earth."¹⁹ While Paul believed that each would rise in his own likeness,

¹⁸Cf. Erich Fascher, "Die Auferstehung Jesu und ihr Verhältnis zur urchristlichen Verkündigung," Z.N.T.W., XXVI (1927), Heft 1, p. 22; John M. Shaw, Essentials and Non-essentials of the Christian Faith (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928), pp. 160 ff.

¹⁹Frank C. Porter, The Mind of Christ in Paul (New York: Charles

his own unchangeable individuality, there is absent from his thinking any suggestion of a resurrection of the flesh which was the transient element.²⁰ It follows that the resurrection of the dead for the Apostle was a resurrection not to the material body, but to a body suited to its new conditions.

The Resurrection Body as a Spiritual Body

Paul's conception of the resurrection body is developed in I Corinthians 15:35 ff., where it is designated by the enigmatic phrase "spiritual body" (*τὸ σῶμα πνευματικόν*). This concept is uniquely Pauline, and the "resurrection of the body" as a doctrine first entered Christianity through the language of Paul.²¹ The Apostle does not speculate as to the nature of this body, or certainly not to the extent that we might wish.

Scribner's Sons, 1930), p. 243. Cf. Paul Althaus, Die Letzten Dinge: Lehrbuch der Eschatologie, Fünfte Auflage (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1949), p. 118; Rudolf Otto, The Idea of the Holy, trans. by John W. Harvey, Rev. Ed. (Oxford: University Press, 1925), pp. 231 f.

²⁰Brunner, The Mediator, p. 149. Paul does not speak of the "resurrection of the flesh" but rather the "resurrection of the dead." However, see Barth, Credo, trans. by J. Strathearn McNab (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1936), p. 169; Wm. Childs Robinson, Christ--The Hope of Glory, p. 191; A. C. McGiffert, The God of the Early Christians (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1924), p. 104; John T. Darragh, The Resurrection of the Flesh (London: Society For Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1921), passim. In these references the interpreters employ the term "the resurrection of the flesh." So also this phrase is still used in the form of the Apostles' Creed prescribed in the Baptismal Service in the Book of Common Prayer, and almost universally in Western Christianity. Cf. A. M. Ramsey, The Resurrection of Christ, pp. 109 ff., who discusses the post-apostolic use of the phrase "the resurrection of the flesh."

²¹John A. T. Robinson, In the End, God . . . : A Study of the Christian Doctrine of the Last Things (London: James Clarke & Co., Ltd., 1950), p. 83. Cf. William E. Wilson, op. cit., p. 565; H. B. Swete, Life of the World to Come (London: S.P.C.K., 1917), pp. 82 f.

His denial and rejection of the crassly material view of the popular Jewish thought did not involve (as it seemed to have done for the Corinthians) the alternative of acceptance of the Greek belief in a disembodied or purely spiritual immortality. Burnett H. Streeter says:

. . . The real meaning and value of the idea of the resurrection of the body does not consist in an affirmation of a material and flesh and blood existence in the future. . . It stands mainly for two things, that the life of the future will be richer and not poorer than this life, and that individuality, personal distinction, and the result of the moral and emotional as well as the intellectual activities of this life will be preserved in the next. . . . It is probable, though less certain, that St. Paul had another reason for insisting on the importance of the body. His Epistles show that the tendencies of thought which appeared a little later as Gnosticism were already beginning to affect the church. A fundamental tenet of this type of thought was the doctrine that matter, and therefore the body, is intrinsically evil and that spirit alone is good. . . . The teaching that the body is an integral part of the complete nature and life of a being who is destined in his whole nature to inherit Eternal Life proved to be one of the strongest guarantees against the invasion of ideas which though sounding to modern ears as unscientific as immoral, had a strong appeal to serious thinkers in that age.²²

²²Burnett H. Streeter et al., Immortality (London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1918), pp. 95 f. See Matthew Arnold, St. Paul and Protestantism (London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1892), pp. 55 ff., who denied (in effect) any physical or bodily resurrection. While he admits that Paul definitely states a belief in a physical resurrection he does not think that deep down Paul really believed it. His position has been adequately invalidated by W. J. Sparrow Simpson, The Resurrection and Modern Thought, pp. 312 ff.; John M. Shaw, The Resurrection of Christ, pp. 139 f.; et al. Cf. Reinhold Niebuhr, Beyond Tragedy: Essays on the Christian Interpretation of History (London: Nisbet and Co. Ltd., 1938), p. 291: "The idea of the resurrection of the body is a profound expression of an essential element in the Christian world-view, first of all because it expresses and implies the unity of the body and the soul. Through all the ages Christianity has been forced to combat, and has at times capitulated to, the notion, that the significance of history lies in the banishment of the good soul in an evil body and in the gradual emancipation of the soul from the body." Dr. Niebuhr continues this thought on pp. 301 f.: "To believe that the body is resurrected is to say, therefore, that eternity is not a cancellation of time and history but that history is fulfilled in eternity. But to insist that the body must be

There seems to be an agreement among authorities that the Apostle presents a view that is something of a middle position between the Greek conception of the immortality of disembodied spirits²³ and the popular Jewish apocalyptic concept of a resurrection of the actual body of flesh.²⁴ The resurrection faith was of an altogether different nature from the philosophical

resurrected is to understand that time and history have meaning only as they are borne by an eternity which transcends them. They could in fact not be at all without that eternity. For history would be meaningless succession without the eternal purpose which bears it."

²³ For a contrast between the Christian belief in the resurrection of the dead and the Greek doctrine of immortality see J. A. T. Robinson, In the End, God, pp. 80 ff.; John M. Shaw, Life After Death (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1945), p. 31; S. D. F. Salmond, The Christian Doctrine of Immortality, 4th Ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901), pp. 458 f.; Gustaf Aulén, The Faith of the Christian Church, trans. from the fourth Swedish Ed. by Eric H. Wahlstrom and G. Everett Arden (Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1948), pp. 247 f. Cf. R. R. Hartford, "St. Paul, Plato and Immortality," Hermathena, LXV (May, 1945), pp. 74-79. Hartford points out similarities in Paul and Plato's views and thinks that the former was indebted to Plato for many of the concepts and words that he employed. However he also points out that in II Cor. 5:3,4 (where Paul states that he has no desire for a disembodied state) it seems that "St. Paul is here opposing the characteristic Platonic attitude to the body." (p. 75)

²⁴ R. F. Hettlinger, "2 Corinthians 5. 1-10," S.J.T., X, No. 2 (June, 1957), p. 186; Philip Carrington, The Early Christian Church, I (Cambridge: University Press, 1957), p. 138; J. S. Whale, "The Resurrection of the Body and the Life Everlasting," Religion In Life, XVIII, No. 3 (Summer No., 1949), p. 440; Stewart, A Man In Christ, p. 268; J. Weiss, Der erste Korintherbrief, p. 345 and The History of Primitive Christianity, II, pp. 536 f.; C. A. A. Scott, Christianity According to St Paul, p. 240; Frank C. Porter, "Paul's Belief in Life After Death," Religion and the Future Life, ed. by E. Hershey Sneath (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1931?), pp. 228 f.; McCasland, The Resurrection of Jesus, p. 35. Cf. J. K. Cameron, op. cit., p. 156; William H. P. Hatch, "St. Paul's view of the Future Life," Paulus-Hellas-Oikumene, p. 96. In addition to the influence of Judaism and Hellenism, Hatch believes that the "Apostle's view of spirit (πνεῦμα) as consisting of very fine or highly attenuated matter is Stoic."

doctrines which regarded the "soul" as in itself immortal, and immortality as the liberation of the soul from the prison house of the body. Such a distinction between "soul" and "body" is altogether foreign to the resurrection faith of the primitive church. The resurrection would have been meaningless for the Apostle if man were, in himself, immortal.

The Resurrection Body Not Mere Spirit

As Paul thought of the resurrection body he did not think in terms of "pure spirit."²⁵ He did not disparage the material; rather he longed for the redemption of the entire fabric of creation. Wilhelm Stählin says:

The kingdom of God for which we wait, is no kingdom of bloodless ghosts, but a realm of redeemed physical nature. It is not only the monstrous and dark daemonic powers that seek for the body as a sphere of realization. God Himself who created the body, wills to reveal His glory in human bodies.²⁶

²⁵Cf. W. L. Knox, St Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, pp. 127 f., who says: "the resurrection of the dead was a resurrection not to the material body, but to a body suited to its new conditions as a pure spirit, instead of a more or less material and fleshly soul" (italics mine). Milligan, The Resurrection of our Lord, pp. 129 f., in speaking of the resurrection body of Christ (which for the Apostle is representative of the future body of believers), thinks of the Lord's body as pure spirit. However, he seems to alter his view on p. 134 when he says: "Not as Divine only but as also human He was perfected. He did not return when He rose, to absolute Divinity; He is not simple spirit now." Cf. M. Goguel, Jesus the Nazarene, pp. 220 f.; J. E. Fison, The Christian Hope: The Presence and the Parousia (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1954), p. 49.

²⁶Vom Schicksal und Sinn der deutschen Jugend, 2nd Aufl. (Wulfingerode-Sollstedt, Treue-Verlag, 1927). As cited by Nicholas Arseniev, We Beheld His Glory, p. 73. For Paul's conception of the redemption of creation see Rom. 8:18-22; Thornton, op. cit., p. 182; Hamilton, op. cit., p. 21; Salmond, op. cit., pp. 556-561; Beasley Murray, Christ Is Alive!, pp. 165, 176 f.

Body and soul belong together as a created unity, and neither may be understood apart from the other.²⁷ Yet neither did the Apostle have in mind the restoration in the eternal world of the self-same material

²⁷To understand Paul's doctrine of the resurrection of the body we must understand what he meant by the word $\tau\acute{o}\mu\alpha$. While we cannot go into detail on this subject, we quote J. A. T. Robinson, In the End, God, who gives an excellent treatment of the subject: "Except perhaps in one instance (I Thess. v.23), St. Paul follows the two-fold Hebraic division of man into soul and flesh, in preference to the threefold Greek division into body, soul and spirit. For the Hebrew, 'spirit' is not a part of man's make-up as such. It is the Spirit of God which comes upon, enters and dwells in the human personality, bestowing on man the possibility of a supernatural life of which as part of nature he is incapable" (p. 83). . . . "Spirit (pneuma) is not a department of human psychology; it is a relationship of God toward man; though, in so far as a man responds to that relationship, he may with truth speak of 'his' spirit, the Spirit which has become his life" (p. 84). "The human person as such, apart from God's Spirit, can be analysed into soul (psyche) and flesh (sarx). . . . Psyche 'embraces all that part of man and his processes which come within the field of the psychologist. Sarx corresponds to that part of man and his processes with which the biologist is concerned" (p. 84). "St. Paul uses both psychikos and sarkikos indifferently to mean 'natural.' The real division came between these two on the one hand and pneuma on the other, which was the realm of the supernatural and divine. Whereas for Platonism the psyche was on the godward side of the line, for St. Paul and the Hebrews generally it is quite definitely not. It is neither divine nor immortal, but as subject to corruption as the flesh" (pp. 84 f.).

"The soma, or body, is the whole psycho-physical unity, made up of sarx and psyche, which constitutes man as distinguished from God. It is the nearest word in Greek for 'personality,' for which none of the ancients had a term. . . . Soma is the whole man constituted as he is by the network of physical and mental relationships in which he is bound up with the continuum of other persons and things. Though soma definitely cannot be defined simply as a man's 'body' ('body,' as opposed to 'mind,' is sarx, not soma), it always means his personality seen as it were from outside rather than by introspection. It is his personality as materially and socially continuous with his environment" (p. 85). See pp. 85 f. for the difference in the Greek thought of what the "body" is and its significance. Cf. Robinson's work, The Body, where he treats this whole subject even more fully. Cf. also Dodd, The Epistle to the Romans, p. 125; W. David Stacey, The Pauline View of Man (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1956), pp. 181-197.

particles of which one's earthly body is composed.²⁸ Such a thought would have been repugnant to him. Moffatt suggests Paul's essential meaning of the expression "spiritual body" when he says: "It is a semi-metaphysical term, essential to his view of the risen life as neither pure spirit nor wrapped in a crudely material shape, neither disembodied nor imagined, in a replica of the present physical constitution."²⁹ The spiritual body is distinct from its mortal counterparts, yet inherently one with it as its continuation (I Cor. 15:35 ff.). This is not to say that the physical body passes into the spiritual body by some biological sequence, as if each possessed the same factual status. As Robinson states:

. . . The relation between this present body and that of the resurrection must be represented both as one of non-identity and yet of continuity. On the one hand, the resurrection body cannot be pictured, as in spiritualism, as this present body simply going on . . .; and yet it must be this body, this personality, transformed, and not another, if continuity of full personal existence is to be preserved (and not lost or interrupted, as, for instance, in theories of reincarnation).

And both these postulates of non-identity and continuity apply to the whole body. There is no room for speculation about which functions are "taken up" and which [are] not.³⁰

²⁸Cf. Tertullian, The Resurrection of the Flesh, 50, where he revives the materialistic Jewish conception.

²⁹The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians (M.N.T.C.), London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938, p. 260. In his exegetical commentary on I Cor. 15:42-50, C. T. Craig, I.B., X (1953), p. 247, says: "Spirit is not the substance out of which the new body is made any more than soul is the substance out of which the earthly body is formed. Our new body will be a body of glory and splendor." Cf. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, p. 199; C. Harris, "State of the Dead," Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, XI, p. 832; A. M. Hunter, Introducing New Testament Theology (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1957), p. 101; S.J. Case, "The Resurrection Faith of the First Disciples," The American Journal of Theology, XIII, No. 2 (April, 1909), pp. 180 f.

³⁰J. A. T. Robinson, In the End, God, pp. 91 f. Cf. Charles, The

Gustav Stählin presents the same thought in different words:

The new creation is not a creatio ex nihilo like the old creation, for the old creation will be changed and incorporated in the new. And even this happened prototypically in Christ, for his resurrection body is the body which died on the cross and lay in the grave and which has been changed into a new Creature.³¹

It is the same body in that the identity is the same, but all is transformed.

Resurrection of Man (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1929), p. 43: "Between the two bodies there is no real continuity or likeness, except in the fact that they are successive expressions of the same spirit, though in different spheres of being" (see also p. 52). However, E. L. Mascall (op. cit., p. 207), in basic agreement with Robinson, says: ". . . We have to conceive our Lord's risen body as possessing complete causal and mimetic (continuity of mental life, especially memory and similar processes) continuity with the body in which he died, although it is no longer subject to the laws under which physical objects manifest themselves to us in our ordinary experience. . . . The former body is not destroyed, but the laws governing it have been woven into higher laws, so that the body whose functions were originally almost wholly describable in the usual physiological categories can now be adequately described only by wider and more embracing terms. In His risen state, the Incarnate Lord can pass through closed doors, can vanish from sight. . . . The Ascension does not mean that Christ's humanity has been destroyed, nor that it is 'in a place above our heads'; what it does mean is that its bodily, mental, and spiritual elements have been woven into such a harmonious whole by the indwelling of the Divine Logos that the physical elements are no longer perceptible to our senses as constituting in themselves a material object."

³¹"On the Third Day," trans. by Wayne P. Todd, Interpretation, X, No. 3 (July, 1950), p. 299. J. S. Whale, "The Resurrection of the Body and the Life Everlasting," op. cit., p. 440, states: "Man's redeemed and risen life beyond death would indeed be 'naked' if it had no glittering identity with what it was here in the order of time and sense; the glittering tumult of history would be but a shadow play with no final reality to give it meaning. Time itself would be no more than the moving image of eternity; its events would not be taken up into eternity, giving actuality to God's redeeming purpose toward us and so becoming part of eternity." Cf. Markus Barth, Der Augenzeuge: Eine Untersuchung über die Wahrnehmung des Menschensohnes durch die Apostel (Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag Ag. Zollikon, 1946), p. 250.

The Natural Body Transformed into the Spiritual

The $\tau\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$ is transformed from the "natural" ($\psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$) to the "spiritual" ($\piνευματικόν$, I Cor. 15:44).³² and this thought is parallel to the "lowly body" and the "glorious body" of Philip-
pians 3:21.³³ This transformation is also in line with the conception of the two aeons, which we have already considered.³⁴ In this connection, John MacQuarrie suggests that the terms "natural body" and "spiritual body" must be understood "existentially."³⁵ The two phrases represent two ways of being; the natural body describes man's way of being on earth, the spiritual body refers to the believer's way of being in the world to come.

³²R. H. Charles (The Resurrection of Man, p. 41) says that the designation "natural body" is misleading and that it should be rendered "a material or psychical body." That is, as Charles states, "a body fitted for the psyche or soul, the existence of which, according to the Apostle, is confined to the world." Charles (pp. 41 f.) says that Paul appeals to Gen. 2:7 for the foundation of his argument on the nature of the soul.

³³The term $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\tau\chi\eta\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ (Phil. 3:21) implies identity of subject with change of form. Cf. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, pp. 514 f. H. Clavier, "Brèves remarques sur la notion de $\tau\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$ $\piνευματικόν$," B.N.T.I.E., p. 351, thinks of the new body as totally different ("totalement différente"). While this view is valid in pointing out the transformation of the material body one must not push this emphasis to the point where the earthly and heavenly bodies are not in some way related in regard to their continuation. Vide supra.

³⁴Adam is the type of the natural man; the Last Adam is the spiritual. Vide supra, pp. 140 ff.

³⁵Op. cit., p. 45.

Ontologically, his [the believer's] being is the same in both cases--he is a body, he exists in a world. Thus the principle of continuity is safeguarded. But ontically [sic] there is a difference. On earth he is always more or less estranged from himself, in the life to come he is at one with himself. For $\pi\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$, like $\tau\hat{\omega}\mu\alpha$, is to be understood not as a substance but as a way of being. It is that way of being in which man is truly himself, as opposed to $\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\varsigma$, in which he loses himself to the world.³⁶

While living in the present aeon believers cannot possess the spiritual body of the coming age, but at the parousia, when the old aeon passes away and the new one comes in full, they will receive the spiritual body which is appropriate for their future redeemed state with Christ (I Cor. 15:49). Paul is emphatic to state: "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God" (I Cor. 15:50). The phrase " $\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\varsigma$ καὶ $\alpha\hat{\iota}\mu\alpha$ " is a single thought³⁷ and refers to human nature, generally fallen humanity, in contrast with God or His Kingdom. Paul is not describing the physical side of man as against his spiritual side; rather he states that neither the living nor the dead can inherit the Kingdom of God as they are--they must be changed. In emphasizing the truth of this verse Joachim Jeremias says: "To illustrate this positive assertion from the Gospel: The dead experience what happened to the Lord in the resurrection; the living experience what happened to the Lord in the trans-

³⁶Ibid.

³⁷A possible interpretation of the sentence is: "neither flesh nor blood can inherit the Kingdom of God." This interpretation requires the alternate reading of the verb ($\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$ --plural) rather than the singular, $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$, which is preferred by Nestle and others. See Joachim Jeremias, "'Flesh and Blood Cannot Inherit the Kingdom of God,'" N.T.S., II (1955-56), pp. 151 f.

figuration."³⁸ Therefore all believers must be transformed before receiving this new body. But death is not an indispensable preliminary through which they must go, because those who are still living at the time of the parousia will be suddenly changed--in the twinkling of an eye (I Cor. 15:51-53).³⁹

Purpose of I Corinthians 15

As we think of Paul's concept of the nature of the resurrection body we must keep in mind his over-all purpose in I Corinthians 15. The Apostle's aim is to settle positively the doubts of the Corinthians who, though believing in the resurrection of Christ, found it difficult to believe in the resurrection of believers. It is significant that Paul does not say, "If Christ has not been raised, then there is no resurrection of the dead." It would be quite true to say that, but what he does say is something much stronger. He states: "If there is no resurrection of the dead, then Christ has not been raised" (vs. 13). He can afford to say this for he knows that the resurrection is a fact. In the earlier verses (vss. 3-8) he has summarized the indisputable evidence for the resurrection. No doubt the Apostle's argument was directed against the "ultra-spiritual" Hellenists who, while they held a belief in the future life,

³⁸Ibid., p. 154. Cf. Robert M. Grant, op. cit., pp. 123 f.; William Childs Robinson, "The Bodily Resurrection of Christ," op. cit., pp. 99 f.; Charles Gore, Belief In God (London: John Murray, 1921), pp. 262 ff.

³⁹Cf. William Childs Robinson, "The Bodily Resurrection of Christ," op. cit., pp. 99 f.

did not think that this future life had to be attained by means of a resurrection.⁴⁰ But in Paul's thought there must be a resurrection because the future life is impossible without one, and the hope of the Christian to share fully the life of Christ necessitates that he should rise from the dead as Christ did.⁴¹ And the fact that Christ had been raised was positive evidence for the future resurrection of believers. The "foolishness" of the question, "With what kind of body do they come?" (15:35b), does not lie in the question itself but in the implied idea that there would be any difficulty in God's meeting the need for a body

⁴⁰W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 292; Moffatt, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, p. 240. J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, II, p. 534, thinks that the Corinthians were combatting the peculiarly Jewish doctrine that the dead would appear from the graves with the same bodies with which they were buried. J. A. T. Robinson (In the End, God, p. 94, note 1) says: "His opponents at Corinth were not denying the general resurrection (what we should call immortality), but only the premature resurrection of departed Christians to enjoy the blessings of the earthly, Messianic Kingdom. They needed to be convinced that these too, like their Lord, would return to this scene. Hence the argument St. Paul uses from the physical resurrection and appearances." Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p. 93, says: "they were representatives of the 'ultra-conservative' eschatological view that there was no resurrection. According to them, only those have anything to hope for who are alive at the Return of Jesus." However, Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 292, disagrees with Schweitzer and thinks that it is unlikely that there were Christians of such exceptionally conservative Jewish views in the Corinthian Church. Davies (p. 292) also discredits Hering's view that Paul had taught that there would be no need of a resurrection of Christians since they had already risen with Christ. Cf. Julius Schniewind, "Die Leugner der Auferstehung in Korinth," in Julius Schniewind: Nachgelassene Reden und Aufsätze, ed. by Ernst Kähler (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1952), pp. 110-139.

⁴¹K. Lake, The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul, p. 215.

fitting the sphere of the future life. Paul takes the analogy of the seed sown in the ground, an analogy which was probably a rabbinic commonplace,⁴² and illustrates the contrast between the present body and that of the future. Its death is the condition of life--"What you sow does not come to life unless it dies" (vs. 36). His point is that God does not bestow this new gift of the resurrection body unless the old body has been put aside. Strictly speaking, a seed does not die if the power of germination remains, and the analogy could be wrongly interpreted that everyone who has had a natural body is, through death, to receive a spiritual body (cf. vs. 49). But the Apostle does not mean to describe a strictly natural process.⁴³

⁴² Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 305 f. He suggests further that the second analogy, that of the different kinds of flesh, would also be familiar to the practising Jews who made distinctions between the different kinds of flesh. Hence in both cases Paul was thoroughly Pharisaic. Cf. Strack and Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, Vol. III (Die Briefe des Neuen Testaments und die Offenbarung Johannis), p. 475.

⁴³ Paul does not attempt to give a modern scientific explanation of the resurrection process. There have been various speculations and attempted explanations of the resurrection process, but all are inadequate. The playwright, Dorothy L. Sayers, The Man Born To Be King (London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1943), pp. 316 f., in speaking of the "Mechanics of the Resurrection" of Jesus, says: "We may therefore suppose that the physical body was, as it were, dissolved into its molecular elements, drawn out through the grave clothes and through the stone, and reassembled outside--this phenomenon being (not surprisingly) accompanied by a violent 'electrical' disturbance, perceptible as a kind of earthquake. . . . The guards feel the tremors, and, on touching the stone, are sensible of some sort of molecular disturbance; and in the next moment this 'electric storm' passes out through the stone, flinging them apart with the shock. At nine feet the Body had materialised sufficiently to flatten the flame of the torch as It passes over it. At thirty paces, It is already assembled into form and solidity. . . . It is also clear that the materialisations were always rapid. There are never any slow-twirlings and thickenings of gaseous matter, as in the ectoplasmic manifestations of the spiritualist séance. Nor do subsequent

He did not believe that powers of germination were resident in a dead body from which would grow another kind of body by a process of natural development.⁴⁴ Men doubt the resurrection because they see nothing in a dead body from which life can spring. Paul would fully grant this because the source of life is in God alone. God would raise the dead by His own miraculous power. The future body is different from that which is sown because the future body is a product of God's creative power--"What you sow is not the body which is to be . . . But God gives it a body as He has chosen" (vss. 37 f.). In essence Paul is saying: "If the life principle in nature can work such wonders why hesitate to believe that the life principle of 'Spirit,' and that too of the divine spirit, can emerge from 'death' into a new and fuller life with a more glorious body!"⁴⁵ Hence, this future body possesses the character of individuality and appropriateness, and yet it is a body richer and fuller than that which is

appearances seem to have produced any of the 'electrical' phenomena that attended the first." This is interesting speculation.

⁴⁴For example, Tertullian claimed that the teeth remain undecayed and serve as seed for the body which is to rise: "It is well-known not only that bones last, but also that teeth continue entire; they are kept as seeds of the body that will sprout at the resurrection." See A. Souter, Tertullian Concerning The Resurrection of the Flesh, Chap. 42 (London: S.P.C.K., 1922), p. 103. Some teachers (R. Joshua b. Hanania, in his reply to Hadrian) believed that the "nut of the spinal column" survived the forces of nature (fire, water, or crushing) and was used of God to "cause man to blossom forth in the future." See Midrash Rabbah, Genesis, XXVIII, 3; Leviticus (Metzora), XVIII, 1.

It is noteworthy that even as the natural body changes over a period of seven years and yet retains its individuality, even so will the resurrection body correspond to the natural body. Cf. Goudge, The First Epistle to the Corinthians, p. 162; E. H. Archer-Shepherd, The Nature and Evidence of the Resurrection of Christ (London: Rivingtons, 1910), pp. 14 f.

⁴⁵Ronald G. Macintyre, The Other Side of Death: A Study in Christian Eschatology (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1920), p. 201.

sown.

It is most important that in our understanding of Paul's analogy and his use of the word "sown" we realize that he is not speaking simply of the "physical" body. As William Childs Robinson points out:

Paul does not describe the body which is sown as a physical body. Those who translate Paul's adjective psychical as physical, or who base their position on this erroneous translation, change the Apostle's meaning. The text says: "It is sown a psychical (psychological, or soulish, or animated, or natural)⁴⁶ body." The body which stands in contrast thereto, i. e., the Spiritual body, is thus not a de-physical or ghost body. Rather, as the soul, nephesh, $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$, is the life principle of the natural body, so will the Spirit, ruach, $\piνε\upsilon\mu\alpha$, be of the Spiritual body.⁴⁷

The Apostle points out that there are different kinds of bodies (vss. 37-44). First, there is the "terrestrial" or "earthly" ($\tau\acute{\omega}\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\tau\omicron$ $\epsilon\pi\iota\gamma\epsilon\iota\omicron$)--a body which is perishable, one of dishonour and of weakness.⁴⁸ But secondly, there is the "celestial" or "heavenly" ($\tau\acute{\omega}\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\tau\omicron$ $\epsilon\pi\omicron\upsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron$)--a body which is imperishable, and one of honour and

⁴⁶Robinson ("The Bodily Resurrection of Christ," op. cit., p. 98, note 36) says that the rendering "physical" made by Goodspeed and by the RSV both changes the meaning of the Greek text, and differs from the majority of the translations.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 98. In his exegetical commentary of I Cor. 15:42-50, Clarence T. Craig (I.B., X, p. 245) agrees with Robinson: "He [Paul] uses the word sown in an entirely and completely figurative sense. He is not referring to the burial of the body, but to the birth of the human individual." So also Charles, The Resurrection of Man, pp. 38 ff.

⁴⁸Cf. G. Vos, "Alleged Development in Paul's Teaching on the Resurrection," op. cit., pp. 203 f., who thinks that it is significant that in his description of the "psychical body" (the body of creation, unfallen) Paul does not use the term sarkic (or the noun sarx). He suggests that Paul intentionally avoids the designation here (Paul does use it in vs. 50) because of its connotation of sinfulness.

of power. The two are related but contrasted:

The Earthly Body

Sown in corruption
Sown in dishonour
Sown in weakness
Sown a natural body

The Heavenly Body

Raised in incorruption;
Raised in glory;
Raised in power;
Raised a spiritual body.⁴⁹

ORIGIN OF THE CONCEPT OF THE SPIRITUAL BODY

As to the origin of the Apostle's concept of the spiritual body it seems most reasonable to assume that it came primarily from his vision of the Risen Lord on the Damascus road.⁵⁰ He saw Christ's resurrection body as a transformed and glorified body, and it was but natural for him to assume that the resurrection body of believers would be like unto His. Thus in a sense Paul introduces into Christianity this most significant thought for the primitive church's eschatological thinking. But it should not be overlooked that Paul's thoughts on the resurrection body are in keeping with the conception of a transformed resurrection body as believed by some of the more spiritually-minded Jewish thinkers.⁵¹ Certainly the

⁴⁹Cf. Professor H. Clavier, "Brèves remarques sur la notion de *σῶμα πνευματικόν*," *op. cit.*, p. 347, who presents Paul's comparison of the earthly and heavenly bodies as a "strophe rythmée." Cf. also W. J. Sparrow Simpson, The Resurrection and Modern Thought, pp. 326-337; Shaw, Life After Death, pp. 30-36.

⁵⁰So H. L. Goudge, The First Epistle to the Corinthians, pp. 155 f.; Kennedy, St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things, p. 91; Stewart, A Man In Christ, p. 268.

⁵¹Cf. Thackeray, *op. cit.*, p. 118. However, cf. Rengstorff, Die Auferstehung Jesu, pp. 65 f. While Rengstorff is not dogmatic on this

more common understanding of the future life was a very materialistic one which did not require any transformation of man's mortal body. But at the same time there was among many of the Pharisees a development towards a more spiritual concept of the future. In his comment on II Baruch 50-51 Charles states:

This conception of transformation, which is as old as Isa. lxv. 17-lxvi, was applied in due course to those who were to live in the renewed world. This is done partially in Isa. lxv. 17-25, but fully in Dan. xii. 2. Also in I Enoch civ. 4, 6, &c. Thus the spiritual transformation was a familiar idea to the Pharisees before the writers of Baruch lived; while I Cor. xv. 35-50 is in one of its aspects the logical sequel of Isa. liv. 17. Paul was not altogether an innovator, but an able and advanced expositor of some current Jewish views.

Opposed to this spiritual view of the future lay the materialistic one prevalent among people and Rabbis alike, which said the blessed should beget children, and eat the flesh of Leviathan (Weber 383, 384).⁵²

Thus in thinking of Paul's rôle in emphasizing the significance of the transformed resurrection body in the thought of the primitive community we should be conscious of the fact that he was not departing from the better thinking of his Pharisaic background. But at the same time this Pharisaic setting should not detract from the greater significance of the Damascus experience. In any case, the originality of Paul's conception of the resurrection body must not be over-emphasized.⁵³

point, he thinks it is "most probable" that Paul was independent of Jewish thought in connection with his view of the resurrection body.

⁵²The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, II (Pseudepigrapha), Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913, p. 508. Cf. Charles' The Resurrection of Man, pp. 15-35.

⁵³Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 308. Cf. Frank C. Porter, "Paul's Belief in Life after Death," Religion and the Future Life, ed. by E. H. Sneath (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1931?), pp. 228 f.

DEVELOPMENT OF PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF THE RESURRECTION BODY

Some scholars have expressed the view that Paul's conception of the resurrection body as found in I Corinthians 15 is different from that found elsewhere in his epistles, notably II Corinthians 5:1-10. Thus R. H. Charles thinks that II Corinthians 5 is a development upon I Corinthians 15 and that there are inherent inconsistencies between the two passages.⁵⁴ W. L. Knox, in thinking that the changes in the Apostle's belief were brought about by the influence of Hellenistic thought, suggests that the Apostle recognized from his experience at Athens that he must adapt his resurrection message to the general mental outlook of the Hellenistic world.⁵⁵ While Knox acknowledges Jewish elements in II Corinthians (e. g., the intense dislike of nakedness at death, which is implied, and the final judgment of mankind), he feels that predominantly the thought is Hellenistic: i. e., (1) the body a burden from which the soul longs to be delivered; (2) the present possession of a preliminary instalment of the Spirit of God; and (3) the soul in the present life an exile from its true home in heaven.⁵⁶ Dodd holds a view somewhat similar to that of Knox.⁵⁷

⁵⁴ A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life, pp. 455 ff. L. Usteri, Schmiedel, Holtzmann, Teichmann, Clemen, Pfeleiderer, Sokolowski, Reuss, and Thackeray have taken the view that between the writing of I Cor. and II Cor. a change came over the thought of the Apostle.

⁵⁵ St Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, pp. 136-145.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ "The Mind of Paul: Change and Development," op. cit., pp. 92-110.

He regards the experience described in II Corinthians 12 as a sort of "second conversion" from which Paul emerges with his futurist eschatology replaced by a realized eschatology.

However, this view has been attacked by such scholars as John Lowe⁵⁸ and W. D. Davies.⁵⁹ Lowe, while grateful to Knox for re-emphasizing the Hellenistic element in Paul, takes issue with both Knox and Dodd. He disagrees with Knox in his attempt to distinguish periods in Paul's development, and to show a continuous growth in the Apostle's teaching in this respect.⁶⁰ Nor does he agree with Dodd that there was necessarily a great inner crisis at the time of Paul's writing II Corinthians which caused a development in his teachings.⁶¹ He shows that the positions of both Dodd and Knox are based on two untenable presuppositions: (1) the possibility of establishing an exact chronology of the Pauline Epistles,⁶² and

⁵⁸"An Examination of Attempts to Detect Developments in St. Paul's Theology," J.T.S., XLII (1941), pp. 129-143.

⁵⁹Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 312 ff.

⁶⁰Op. cit., pp. 135 f.

⁶¹Ibid., pp. 138 ff.

⁶²Because of the occasional character of the Apostle's letters he feels that there is no a priori reason to expect to be able to trace an evolutionary movement in his thinking (p. 131). This is related to the uncertain chronology of the letters and the fact that "every one of the letters lies within a period of a dozen years, viz., A. D. 50-62." Nor were any of the letters written immediately following his conversion or during the early formative stage in Paul's career as a Christian (p. 132). "All our direct information covers only a decade of his life, a decade when he was probably between 45 and 60 years of age" (p. 133). E. Andrews, op. cit., p. 243, agrees with Lowe's chronology.

(2) the fact that Paul is less vivid in his description of the eschatological hope in his later epistles justifies the assumption that he gave up the hope for the future or lost interest in it.⁶³

The Hellenization of the Apostle's Thinking?

Davies attacks Knox's view that the thought of II Corinthians 5 is predominantly Hellenistic.⁶⁴ He discusses the two thoughts (the spirit a present possession, and life in this world an exile) and endeavours to show that they are not necessarily Hellenistic. He dismisses the last thought with these words: "The idea of this present life being an exile is surely so commonplace that we need not postulate any specifically Hellenistic influence to account for it."⁶⁵ Earlier in his work Davies shows that Paul's conception of the spirit is far removed from the Hellenistic ideas.⁶⁶ He acknowledges that the language of II Corinthians 5 might seem to suggest Hellenistic influences, but after a detailed examination of this point he convincingly demonstrates that Paul's language can be explained without recourse to Hellenistic sources. Davies questions Knox's two assumptions: (1) that Paul's experience at Athens was of such

⁶³See Stewart, A Man In Christ, pp. 270-272; Guy, op. cit., pp. 125-128.

⁶⁴Cf. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p. 134; Walter Grundmann, "ἐκὸν καὶ ἐν," "ἐνδὸν καὶ ἐν," T.W.N.T., II, pp. 62-64, who also think that II Cor. 5 can be explained without recourse to direct Hellenistic influences.

⁶⁵Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 312.

⁶⁶Ibid., pp. 177-226.

profound significance for his thought;⁶⁷ and (2) that I Corinthians 15 implies the "dematerializing" of the resurrection.⁶⁸ For these reasons, and justly so, Professor Davies does not accept the interpretation of II Corinthians as the Hellenization of the Apostle's thought.⁶⁹

Parallel and New Ideas in the Comparison of I Corinthians 15 and II Corinthians 5

In spite of the many voices that have insisted that Paul's concept of the resurrection as found in I Corinthians 15 is different from that found in II Corinthians 5, there are many others, such as Kennedy,⁷⁰ Alfred E. Garvie,⁷¹ and W. Morgan,⁷² who maintain that there is no basic change

⁶⁷Knox, St Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, p. 26, says that when Paul preached at Athens the Greeks laughed at his doctrine of the resurrection. He writes: "It is significant that from this time onwards his Epistles show a progressive adaptation of the Christian message to the general mental outlook of the Hellenistic world. There is no reason for doubting that he was first compelled to face the need of this restatement by his chance meeting with serious philosophy on the Areopagus."

⁶⁸Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 187 f., 314.

⁶⁹Davies (Ibid., p. 320) concludes his study on this problem with these thoughts: "We close our study, therefore, with the assertion that it is wholly artificial to make too sharp a dichotomy between the Hebraic and the Hellenistic elements in Paul's thought, and that any Hellenistic elements which may be found in his thought do not imply that he was therefore outside the main current of first-century Judaism."

⁷⁰St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things, pp. 262 ff.

⁷¹Studies of Paul and His Gospel (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1911), pp. 20-36.

⁷²Op. cit., p. 239.

of thought in the two passages. In agreement with these scholars, Thornton,⁷³ Goudge,⁷⁴ and E. G. Selwyn⁷⁵ have shown that there are several parallel ideas in the two passages, and that the II Corinthians 5 passage is a working out of I Corinthians. Both passages contrast the mortal body and the resurrection body, and emphasize their continuity; both emphasize the God-given character of the risen body and of the transformation. This is illustrated in I Corinthians 15 by the analogy from nature; in II Corinthians 5:5 it is effected by reference to the *ἐκπαύω* of the Spirit. As the hidden work of God goes on invisibly in the seed sown, so also it goes on invisibly in the mortal body of the believer by virtue of the guarantee of the Spirit. The meaning is the same whether Paul says "God gives it a body as he has chosen" (I Cor. 15:38), or "we have a building from God" (II Cor. 5:1). While there is no radical development in the II Corinthians 5 passage there do appear certain differences. For example, there is a change in the setting or mood of the argument. In the earlier passage Paul is dealing with doubts and questionings; in the latter he contrasts the sufferings of the present with the glory of the future, mentioning his dread of disembodiment at death (vss. 2-4). Further, there is the new suggestion in II Corinthians

⁷³Op. cit., pp. 284-286.

⁷⁴The Second Epistle to the Corinthians, pp. 50 ff.; The First Epistle to the Corinthians, p. 161.

⁷⁵"The Resurrection," Essays Catholic & Critical, ed. by E. G. Selwyn, 3rd Ed. (London: S.P.C.K., 1929), p. 290.

5:8 that deceased believers are already "at home with the Lord."⁷⁶

Jeremias, whose view on the matter seems most reasonable, asserts: "The statement that the Pauline conception of the resurrection has not undergone fundamental mutations does not exclude the possibility that Paul has gained new insights concerning the details."⁷⁷ He maintains that Paul's new insight was that flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, or, in other words, the living as well as the deceased must be changed before they can enter the perfected Kingdom. This new insight is what Paul had in mind when in I Corinthians 15:51 he speaks of a mystery--"I tell you a mystery . . . we shall all [i. e. the living as well as the dead] be changed." Jeremias says that this idea was not mentioned prior to I Corinthians 15 (e. g., there is no such idea in I Thess. 4:17) and that in the later writings it becomes a dominating idea (e. g., II Cor. 5:1-5; Phil. 3:20 f.; Rom. 8:11, 23).⁷⁸ We must agree with Jeremias, that while Paul did not undergo any radical changes in his conception of the future resurrection body, he at the same time did grow in his understanding of it. Indeed, it would be no compliment

⁷⁶Cf. E. G. Selwyn, Ibid. Vide infra pp. 260f. for J. N. Sevenster's interpretation of II Cor. 5:8.

⁷⁷"Flesh and Blood Cannot Inherit the Kingdom of God," op. cit., p. 158.

⁷⁸Ibid., see pp. 158 f. Cf. Plummer, op. cit., p. 161: "The Epistles to the Corinthians are written in the glow of intense feeling, and it is unreasonable to interpret them as if they were parts of a carefully elaborated system of theology."

to the Apostle to insist that his mind was not open to new ideas as years passed and as the claims of churches for guidance came to him; or that independently of these, he was ever seeing, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, new glory and power in the Risen Lord.⁷⁹

⁷⁹Macintyre, The Other Side of Death, p. 183. Cf. Edward Carpenter, "Growth and Development," That Man Paul (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1953), pp. 89-102.

IV: THE INTERMEDIATE STATE

The relation of I Corinthians 15 and II Corinthians 5 introduces the subject of the time of the resurrection and the matter of the intermediate state. Several scholars, while agreeing that in I Thessalonians 4 and in I Corinthians 15 Paul thought of the resurrection body as acquired at the parousia, nevertheless think that in II Corinthians 5 the Apostle has transcended his earlier view, and now thinks of the resurrection body as awaiting the believer from the moment of death.¹ Those who interpret this as Paul's new view consider it to be an advancement in thought due primarily to the conditions of the time, i. e., the delayed parousia.

Various Interpretations of II Corinthians 5:1 ff.

Paul's statement in II Corinthians 5:1 is interpreted to indicate that he thought that the resurrection would take place immediately upon death: "For we know that if the earthly tent we live in is destroyed, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." Charles insists in rendering the phrase $\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\ \dots\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\upsilon\theta\eta\sigma\iota\mu\epsilon\upsilon$ as when the earthly house is destroyed, and he stresses the present $\epsilon\chi\omicron\mu\epsilon\upsilon$ to imply the immediate possession of the resurrection

¹Cf. R. H. Charles, A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity, 2nd Ed. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1913), p. 457, The Resurrection of Man, pp. 44 ff., 52, 54; William E. Wilson, op. cit., p. 565; Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 317 ff.; Hettlinger, op. cit., pp. 183 ff.; G. B. Stevens, The Pauline Theology, pp. 358 f.; Streeter, Immortality, p. 119.

body after death.² However, all that the sentence in itself states is that the loss of the earthly body will be compensated, at some time, by the supervening of a heavenly body. The context of this passage is given in the conclusion to chapter 4 (vss. 16-18) where Paul is contrasting present distresses with future glory and the transient with the eternal. 'Εἶναι with the aorist subjunctive (καταλυθῆναι) frequently has the force of a future perfect, and the present tense (ἔχοντες) is often used of a future which is absolutely certain.³ Nothing is said about the time when this certainty shall become actuality. It is therefore unnecessary to understand II Corinthians 5:1 f. in any other way than that which sees in it the expression of a longing for the resurrection which the Apostle teaches elsewhere will be provided at the parousia.⁴

Of the scholars who believe that there is no room, nor need, in Paul's theology for an intermediate state, W. D. Davies is one of the outstanding present-day spokesmen.⁵ He attempts to bridge this gap of

²A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life, pp. 458 f., The Resurrection of Man, p. 45. In the latter work Charles thinks that the life which the patriarchs already enjoy (he refers to Luke 20:35-38) presupposes their resurrection as already having taken place (see pp. 53, 56).

³G. Vos, "Alleged Development in Paul's Teaching on the Resurrection," op. cit., pp. 208 f.

⁴See Ibid., pp. 208 ff.; Beasley Murray, op. cit., pp. 210 f.; Kennedy, St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things, pp. 264 ff.

⁵More recently R. F. Hettlinger (op. cit.) has expressed a view similar to that of Dr. Davies. He also believes that between I and II Cor. Paul's Asian experience made him question the earlier assumption

the intermediate period by utilizing the concept of the new age as eternally existent and constructing upon this principle an argument that the resurrection body (the body of the final age to come) is already being formed as believers are being transformed into the new age.⁶ At death the disciple passes into the final and complete state of the new age and thus comes into full possession of his spiritual body. Relating to this he shows that Paul's later epistles speak not so much of the resurrection as they do of the Christian's revelation. "For the creation waits with eager longing for the revealing of the sons of God" (Rom. 8:19). "When Christ who is our life appears, then you also will appear with him in glory" (Col. 3:4).

There is no need to resurrect those who have already died and risen with Christ and received their heavenly body, but they may be revealed. The final consummation would merely be the manifestation of that which is already existent but 'hidden' in the eternal order.⁷

(I Cor. 15) that he would probably survive to the parousia (pp. 183, 186). Hettlinger thinks that the Apostle abandoned the popular Jewish doctrine of an identity of material elements and in doing so altered his view of the resurrection body. "... In thus abandoning the doctrine of an identity of material elements, St. Paul was undermining the logical necessity for postponing the hope of a heavenly clothing until the Parousia. Moreover, he believed that resurrection had already become a reality in the person of Christ before the end of this age and the transformation of the material universe" (p. 187). Accordingly, Hettlinger believes that the believer (as an individual) receives his resurrection body at death rather than at Christ's parousia, when the "full resurrection . . . of the whole Body" takes place (the perfection of the person in its corporateness). See pp. 192 f.

⁶Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 318.

⁷Ibid. Cf. Charles, The Resurrection of Man, p. 46.

This means that deceased believers already possess their new bodies and that the so-called final resurrection is simply the manifestation of a fact already existent but hidden in the eternal order. Granting the validity of this argument, there would be no need nor reason for an intermediate state of the dead in the Apostle's eschatology.

The Resurrection Body Acquired at the Parousia

Though we recognize that this is a much debated issue, in the view of the writer, it seems certain that Paul thought of the resurrection body as acquired at the parousia. While we have already emphasized the significance of the rising with Christ in the present age, and while we agree with Dr. Davies in saying that Paul believed the Age to Come had already dawned, we feel that this truth does not merit his conclusion. In one's rising with Christ he finds a new source of life for the present age and he experiences the gift of the Spirit from the Risen Christ. This Spirit is a seal (II Cor. 1:22; Eph. 4:30), a guarantee (II Cor. 5:5; Eph. 1:13, 14), a promise (Gal. 3:14) of the life to come, and Paul can say that we have the first fruits of the Spirit, but we still groan inwardly for the redemption of our bodies (Rom. 8:23). There is no question as to the fact that this redemption has begun; rather the question is when this redemption of the body will be completed. To think of death as the occasion of this redemption of the body and the acquiring of the new body is to give the moment of death a significance which it hardly possessed for the Apostle.⁸

⁸Cf. J. A. T. Robinson, In the End, God, p. 97; The Body, pp. 78 f.

Those who hold the view that the believers receive their new bodies at death assume that in II Corinthians 5 Paul is referring to the condition of those who have died. This assumption naturally colours the whole of their interpretation of this passage (vss. 1-10). But, on the other hand, numerous scholars (with whom we would agree) maintain that in reality the Apostle is thinking of those who will be alive at the parousia.⁹ These interpreters hold that here, as in I Corinthians 15, the Apostle is primarily concerned with the condition of believers at the parousia, and this, and not the point of death, is the moment under discussion. Paul assumes that at the parousia the great majority of Christians will still be alive.

According to the thought of J. A. T. Robinson, Davies' view (vide supra) would place undue emphasis on individualism in Paul's concept of the resurrection. Dr. Robinson has pointed out, and justly so, that "The resurrection body signifies . . . the solidarity of the recreated universe in Christ."¹⁰ "There is therefore no ultimate distinction between the individual resurrection body and the one resurrection Body, any more than one can isolate the present individual theologically (or, for that matter,

⁹See H. L. Goudge, The Second Epistle to the Corinthians, pp. 47, 48, 50 ff.; Clayton R. Bowen, The Resurrection in the New Testament (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1911), pp. 98 f.; Lyder Brun, "Zur Auslegung von II Cor. 5:1-10," Z.N.T.W., Heft 3/4 (1929), pp. 207-229; Albrecht Oepke, "Υμῶς," T.W.N.T., I, pp. 773 f., "ἐκδύω" and "ἐνδύω," T.W.N.T., II, pp. 318-21; A. M. Ramsey, The Resurrection of Christ, p. 108; J. A. T. Robinson, In the End, God, pp. 95 f.; R. P. C. Hanson, II Corinthians (Torch Bible Commentaries), London: SCM Press, 1954, pp. 45 f.

¹⁰The Body, p. 79.

scientifically) from the whole 'body' of creation."¹¹ Robinson thinks of the resurrection of the body as beginning at baptism when one is incorporated into the body of Christ (i. e., the church), and its ultimate destiny is the transformation from a natural body to a spiritual body. The completion of this transformation must wait upon the day of the Parousia.¹²

Nowhere in the New Testament has the resurrection of the body anything specifically to do with the moment of death. The key 'moments' for this are baptism and the Parousia. Death is significant, not for the entry into the new solidarity, but for the dissolution of the old. This act of dissolution, even for the individual, is only partial; for the solidarity of the 'body of sin' is bound up with this age rather than with this earth. The dead, just because of their death, do not escape from the sighing and the patience with which we must all await the redemption of our body (Rom. 8.23-5). We do not have any advantage over them (I Thess. 4.15) nor they over us: we are both 'together' in this matter (I Thess. 4.17). As the author of the Apocalypse puts it, the cry of the dead in Christ still goes up 'How long?' (Rev. 6.10) while the powers of this age are yet alive.¹³

Likewise, Cullmann rightly stresses that there is no valid ground for the assertion that Paul taught that Christians were to receive their new bodies prior to the parousia, and to consider otherwise would be to render without meaning such passages as I Thessalonians 4:13 f.¹⁴ Indeed, this

¹¹Ibid., note 1.

¹²Ibid., pp. 79 f.

¹³Ibid. So also Robinson's In the End, God, pp. 88-90, 97 f.; William Manson, "Eschatology in the New Testament," Eschatology, by Wm. Manson et al. (S.J.T. Occasional Papers, No. 2), Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd Ltd., 1953, pp. 13 f.; Floyd V. Filson's exegesis of II Cor. 5, I.B., X, pp. 326 ff.

¹⁴Christ and Time, pp. 231, 237. He states: "The New Testament knows nothing of an immediate resurrection of the body that will occur for each one immediately after his death. The very gospel that most strongly emphasizes the present reality of the salvation attained in Christ, the

line of thought would reduce the resurrection on the last day to a meaningless anti-climax because it is difficult to see what the resurrection is intended to accomplish.¹⁵ It seems imperative that if we are to remain faithful to the New Testament witness we must say that even after death there is still the tension between the present and the future--the dead ask, "How long yet?" (Rev. 6:10).¹⁶

The Believer with Christ

In thinking of an intermediate state one should always remember that this does not mean a rigid and severe separation from God.¹⁷ Certainly the dead do not experience the communion with their Risen Lord that they look forward to after the parousia, but Paul still thinks of the dead as "the

Gospel of John, in which Christ designates himself as 'the resurrection,' does not permit the future to be separated from the present in such a way that no room remains any longer for a special eschatological event. To be sure, the believer already has eternal life, but here too the raising of the body takes place only at the last days. . . . It belongs to the time tension in which we now live between the resurrection and the return of Christ that, as Paul says, 'God has delivered us from death and will deliver us' (II Cor. 1:10). (p. 38)

¹⁵ Hettlinger "tries" not to ignore the significance of the parousia altogether. He thinks that the individual receives the resurrection body at death, "but the resurrection and the redemption of the Body [the Church] is not achieved until the end of the ages (Rom. 8.23; Eph. 4.30)." (Op. cit., p. 193). However, such distinction between the individual and the body is nowhere taught by the Apostle. See Robinson, The Body, pp. 79 f.

¹⁶ Cf. Cullmann, Christ and Time, p. 240.

¹⁷ Cf. Guy, op. cit., p. 117, and W. Morgan, op. cit., p. 233, who think that on the basis of Eph. 4:9 Paul probably shared the conventional view of Hades (Sheol) as the abode of the dead.

dead in Christ" (I Thess. 4:16). Also he can say that his "desire is to depart and be with Christ" (Phil. 1:23); "So we are always of good courage; we know that while we are at home in the body we are away from the Lord . . . and we would rather¹⁸ be away from the body and at home with the Lord" (II Cor. 4:6-8).¹⁹ These references appear to indicate that in Paul's thinking the Christian's relationship with Christ can never be broken.²⁰

J. N. Sevenster suggests that the key to the condition of believers during this period is II Corinthians 5:3: "that we may not be found naked." He argues forcefully that while the term "naked" (*γυμνός*) does indicate that Paul did not look forward to this state between death and resurrection, it cannot be interpreted to mean separation from Christ.

¹⁸In his exegetical commentary on "The Second Epistle to the Corinthians" Floyd V. Filson (I.B., X, p. 330) thinks that the RSV translation "we would rather" is too strong. "Paul is 'quite content' to die, but he does not mean that he enthusiastically prefers it. He sees a limitation in either lot. If he remains in this body, he will not see the Lord as he would after death; if he dies, he will be without a body, and that is a state from which he shrinks. But the privilege of being at home with the Lord and seeing him more fully, even before the end of this age, is enough to enable him to overcome his shrinking and be quite content to face physical death."

¹⁹This view is supported by Jesus' words to the robber, "Today you will be with me in Paradise" (Luke 23:43). The verse has nothing to say about the believer receiving his resurrection body at that time. Cf. Cullmann, Christ and Time, pp. 238 f.

²⁰Indeed, Wernle (The Beginnings of Christianity, I, p. 287) feels justified in concluding, "The longing to die and to be with Christ is for him [Paul] identical with the hope in the resurrection. This longing spans the chasm that lies between death and the resurrection, and proceeds straight to the desired goal, to the meeting with Jesus."

In substance his argument goes as follows. Paul sees the believer's experience with Christ in three states or stages: (1) the present stage, in which the Christian is in his earthly body and away from the Lord (II Cor. 5:6); (2) the intermediate state, in which the believer is away from the earthly body but with the Lord (II Cor. 5:8; Phil. 1:23); and (3) the final stage when one will always be with the Lord (I Thess. 4:17). Stage two is preferred to stage one, but stage three is desired above all. Paul hopes stage two, if at all, will be short.²¹

Activity of the Holy Spirit

The Apostle does not venture to say anything about the activity of the Spirit during the intermediate state. G. Vos, who has laid great importance on the Spirit both in the present rising and the future resurrection, cautiously offers the suggestion (on the basis of the phrase "dead in Christ"--I Thess. 4:16) that even during the intermediate period the Spirit would serve as the "gradual preparatory agent for bringing about the event

²¹ "Some Remarks on the Γ Τ Μ Ν Δ Σ in II Cor. V.3," Studia Paulina; in Honorem Johannis De Zwaan (Haarlem: De Erven F. Bohn N.V., 1953), pp. 204-207. Sevenster thinks of "nakedness" as the designation of the intermediate state of all the deceased, believers and non-believers. Most authorities are in agreement with Sevenster that γυμνός here is not a speculation on the nature of the intermediate state but the expression of a human dread of death. However, A. Oepke ("ΕΚΔΥΩ," T.W.N.T., II, p. 319) states that in light of Phil. 1:23 "nakedness" can apply only to non-believers: "Unter ΕΚΔΥΩ ist daher nicht das Ablegen des Leibes seitens der Gläubigen beim Sterben vor der Parusie, sondern das Schicksal der Nichtgläubigen zu verstehen, die im Sterben, vor oder bei der Parusie, ihren irdischen Leib verlieren, ohne doch den Himmelsleib zu haben, welcher der Gläubigen bei der Parusie wartet."

of the resurrection."²² Cullmann thinks the gift of the Holy Spirit is a permanent gift which one possesses even while waiting for the resurrection.

Der Heilige Geist ist eine Gottesgabe, die man mit dem Tode nicht verlieren kann. Der in Christus Verstorbene hat den Heiligen Geist, obwohl er noch "schläft" und noch auf die Auferstehung des Leibes wartet, die ihm erst das volle und wahre Leben schenken wird.²³

Certainly Paul had the natural fear of being unclothed at death,²⁴ but at the same time he has the confidence of being with Christ even in the intermediate state. This is true because the Apostle felt that the Holy Spirit as God's power would prevent death from getting any hold during this period of waiting. The believers, who formerly knew the resurrection power

²²"Alleged Development in Paul's Teaching on the Resurrection," op. cit., p. 205. J. Weiss (The History of Primitive Christianity, II, p. 536) makes another suggestion (less attractive): "Perhaps it was conceived somewhat in this manner, that in the case of these dead--at first only the Christians who have died are in mind--the Spirit of God which was in them had meanwhile slowly completed the 'quickenings' of their mortal bodies (Rom. 8:11; pp. 523 f), so that at the moment of the resurrection the final remnant of the mortal body remained behind in the grave as a cast-off garment, and they emerged from the grave now fully transformed in bodies of glory." Hardman, op. cit., pp. 75 f., expresses a similar idea in suggesting that during the intermediate period the process of redemption is being continued in those "with Christ."

²³"Unsterblichkeit der Seele und Auferstehung der Toten," op. cit., p. 153.

²⁴Professor Wm. Manson, who holds the view that Paul believed in an intermediate state, points out, "that the apostle did not find it easy to adjust his mind to the idea of an intermediate state (2 Cor. 5:1-8). As a Christian of the first generation he looked for everything that is mortal to be at the earliest date 'swallowed up in life'." ("Eschatology in the New Testament," in Eschatology, p. 14). Cf. Goudge (The Second Epistle to the Corinthians, p. 50) who likewise holds to the view of an intermediate state: "They [the early Christians] had little interest in the intermediate state; and when they looked forward to the future, they thought not so much of resurrection, as of the transformation of their present bodies into bodies worthy of the divine kingdom."

of the Spirit in their earthly lives, would still benefit from the resurrection of Christ. As Cullmann says: "If that were not so, then indeed all these dead would be in precisely the same situation as were the Jews before the resurrection of Christ."²⁵ Thus those who died in Christ were not lonely (II Cor. 5:5); the Holy Spirit was with them and this state cannot separate them from Christ (Rom. 8:38).

Some have expressed the view that the believer is conscious of the Lord's presence;²⁶ that the believer is in a condition of happiness and peace with Christ;²⁷ and that he is given honour and comfort while waiting for the Lord (Rev. 6:11).²⁸ Actually Paul speaks of the dead as "sleeping" (*κοιμῶν*) in Christ or simply as sleeping until the time of the resurrection (I Cor. 15:18, 20, 51; I Thess. 4:13-15). The term "sleep" is to

²⁵ Christ and Time, p. 238.

²⁶ Alfred Plummer, op. cit., p. 150. Plummer thinks that II Cor. 5:6-8 assumes that the believer is conscious of the Lord. "Otherwise, departure from the body would be a worse condition, with regard to Him [Paul], than being in the body" [when Paul was in communion with the Lord]. Cf. Vos, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Resurrection," op. cit., pp. 9 f.

²⁷ Wm. H. P. Hatch, "St. Paul's View of the Future Life," op. cit., p. 94. See Oscar Hardman, The Resurrection of the Body, (London: S.P.C.K., 1934), pp. 72 ff., for speculation as to what Paul meant by the dead sleeping.

²⁸ Cf. Floyd V. Filson, Jesus Christ The Risen Lord, p. 267. Cf. also G. Vos, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Resurrection," op. cit., p. 9. In speaking about life after death and the intermediate state, Vos says: "The Apostle . . . continues to make use of the common language of the day in teaching about these things, and there is hardly any perceptible effort on his part to correct or modify the latter. What he does is to fill with vital substance language that had so largely become voided of meaning."

be understood as an euphemism for death, and as denoting the blessed rest in fellowship with the Lord.²⁹ Gullmann rightly states, "It is permissible to think that these dead are kept with Christ even before their body is raised, even before they receive the spiritual body."³⁰ Indeed, the truth of Paul's quotation of the triumph of life over death at the parousia can be likewise applied to this time during which the dead in Christ sleep, awaiting their revealed and complete victory over death. "Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting?"³¹ "For I am sure that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor anything else in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord."³²

In conclusion, we see that Paul desired to receive the spiritual body without dying--to acquire the new body as soon as possible. But if he does die before the parousia he has the assurance of continuing "in

²⁹Stevens, The Pauline Theology, p. 343. Rengstorff (Die Auferstehung Jesu, p. 102) says that while Paul refers to Christians as "sleeping," he does not speak of Jesus (after His death) as "sleeping," but rather as being dead (ἀποθνήσκειν --cf. I Cor. 15:3; II Cor. 5:15; I Thess. 5:10). He suggests that the sleeping which Christians enjoy is "eine Frucht des Todes Jesu." However, while Rengstorff's statement is usually the case, in I Cor. 15:20 Paul does think of Christ as being "the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep."

³⁰Christ and Time, p. 239.

³¹I Cor. 15:54 f.

³²Rom. 8:38 f.

Christ" even during this imperfect state. Because of the expectation of the shortness of time and the firmness of the conviction that believers would never be separated from their Lord, it is easily understandable why the matter of the intermediate state never confronted Paul as a vital issue. While it is of interest to us as we contemplate the eschatological thinking of the Apostle, it should be borne in mind that it does not have fundamental bearing on Paul's concept of the final resurrection.

V: TWO RESURRECTIONS

Some scholars hold that Paul conceives of two separate resurrections: (1) the resurrection of Christians to a temporary Messianic Kingdom on earth; and (2) a general resurrection of all men for the purpose of being judged worthy or unworthy of the ultimate Kingdom of God.¹ The analogy of the well known passage in Revelation 20:1-7 has undoubtedly led interpreters to look for the idea of two resurrections in the Apostle Paul's epistles.²

Basis of the View of Two Separate Resurrections

There are several important matters that have influenced many of these interpreters in their thinking. First, the background of I Corinthians 15:24-28 is thought of as apocalyptic, and since later apocalyptic literature, both Jewish and Christian, conceives of a temporary Messianic era coming

¹Some important representatives of this view are: Rich. Kabisch, Die Eschatologie des Paulus (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1893), pp. 259 ff.; Thackeray, op. cit., pp. 120 ff.; Morgan, op. cit., pp. 229, 234-237; J. Weiss, Der erste Korintherbrief, pp. 356 ff.; Lietzmann, An die Korinther (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament), zweite auflage (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1923), pp. 81 f.; Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, pp. 66-69. Cf. J. A. T. Robinson, In the End, God, pp. 93 ff., Jesus and His Coming (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1957), pp. 31 f.

²Cf. G. Vos, "The Pauline Eschatology and Chiliasm," op. cit., pp. 32 f. While the idea of a Messianic reign is found in Jewish apocalyptic, Vos states that the difference between two kingdoms in 4 Ezra and Baruch was never carried through to the point of a distinction between two resurrections. In his footnote on p. 53 of this same article Vos points out the difference between the chiliasm found in Rev. 20:4 and that in I Cor. 15:22 ff. So also Ragnar Leivestad, Christ the Conqueror (London:

after the end of history and preceding the eternal Kingdom of God, it is assumed that Paul presupposes such an era here.³ Second, verses 23 and 24 of I Corinthians 15 are linked together and attention is focussed on ἀπαρχή ("first fruit") . . . ἔπειτα ("then") . . . εἰτα ("then"). Thackeray understands this to have reference to two intervals of time; one (clearly indicated) between the resurrection and the parousia and the other implied between the parousia and consummation.⁴ This latter interval is thought of as the time allowed by Paul for the future Messianic reign of Christ. Third, τὸ τέλος of I Corinthians 15:24 is interpreted as "the rest" in the sense of "the remaining ones" or "the rest of the dead," and is thought of as having reference to the general resurrection that is to follow the resurrection of believers.⁵ Weiss thinks that this interpretation of τὸ τέλος would supply an obvious third order (τάγμα) which would be more natural than the enumeration of only two (i. e., Christ

S.P.C.K., 1954), pp. 133 f. Cf. also H. L. Goudge's "Additional Note on 'The Millennial Reign of Christ,'" The First Epistle to the Corinthians, pp. 163 f.; Guy, op. cit., pp. 150 f. See McGiffert, op. cit., p. 452, where he points out the significance of chiliasm in the apocryphal books of the early church.

³Cf. Moffatt, The First Epistle to the Corinthians, pp. 248 f.; Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p. 68.

⁴Op. cit., pp. 121 f. Also Weiss, Lietzmann, ad loc.; Kabisch, op. cit., pp. 259 f.; Robinson, Jesus and His Coming, pp. 31 f. The writer is indebted largely to Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 293 f., for this presentation of the argument concerning two resurrections.

⁵Weiss, Der erste Korintherbrief, pp. 357 f., and The History of Primitive Christianity, II, p. 532; Lietzmann, An die Korinther, pp. 81 f.

and the believers) referred to in verse 23.⁶

Objections to the Two-resurrection Hypothesis

There are weighty arguments against the two-resurrection hypothesis. First, the view that I Corinthians 15:24-28 is apocalyptic rests entirely upon an assumption. Nowhere in Paul's epistles does there appear a single passage (taken on its own ground) that can be interpreted as teaching a future millennial reign of Christ, and only when apocalyptic ideas are read into the passage in question can it be made to yield such a concept.⁷ In Schweitzer's survey of the historical development of apocalyptic in Judaism he attempts to force the eschatological details of Paul's epistles into that eschatological framework which he finds in first-century Judaism.⁸ In Dr. Davies' estimation of Schweitzer's view he says:

We must insist . . . that it is erroneous thus to make Paul conform too closely to current apocalyptic speculation. That, in his eschatology, the Apostle drew upon the latter for his terms will be obvious, but the character of that eschatology was determined not by any traditional scheme but by that significance which Paul had been led to give to Jesus. This is merely to affirm that his eschatology was subservient to his faith and not constitutive to it.⁹

⁶Weiss, Der erste Korintherbrief, p. 358.

⁷Robert B. Barnes in his unpublished thesis, The Eschatological Reference of the Cardinal Concepts of St. Paul's Theology (The University of Edinburgh, 1957), pp. 105 ff. Dr. Barnes thinks that Paul was probably familiar with the apocalyptic literature of history and that he made use of its material. "But it is important to recognize that, as far as eschatological background is concerned, it is to the Old Testament and not to Jewish apocalypticism that he is most indebted" (p. 9). Cf. F. C. Porter, "The Place of Apocalyptical Conceptions in the Thought of Paul," J. B. L., XLI (1922), Parts I and II, pp. 183-204.

⁸The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, Chapter 5.

⁹Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 290. So also Bowman, The Intention

Thus one cannot justifiably say that the Apostle borrowed the contemporary Messianic categories and then proceeded to construct his specifically Christian eschatology on their basis.

Second, Kennedy has shown that the occurrence of $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\tau\alpha$ in I Corinthians 15:23-24 need not be taken to imply an intervening period when Christ rules over His Kingdom.¹⁰ He refers to passages such as John 13:4, 5; 19:26, 27, where both $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\tau\alpha$ are used without implying a lengthy interval.¹¹ Similarly, Barth maintains that $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\tau\alpha$ is not a third $\tau\acute{\alpha}\chi\eta\mu\alpha$ of the resurrection but a closer definition of the final act.¹² It is impossible to use this argument for, or against, the view of two resurrections because the terms may introduce either what is subsequent, or what is immediately consequent.¹³

of Jesus, pp. 52 ff.

¹⁰St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things, pp. 322 f.; cf. also M. Dibelius, Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1909), p. 100; J. A. MacCulloch, "Eschatology," Hastings' Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, V, p. 386.

¹¹In his references Kennedy also mentions I Cor. 15:5, 6, 7. As we have seen above, probably a week or more elapsed between the appearances to Peter and the Twelve (vs. 5) and that to the 500 (vs. 6).

¹²The Resurrection of the Dead, p. 171. Michaelis (Der Kirchenfreund, 1931) thinks of the final events as taking place in rapid succession, but not necessarily in a 24-hour day: "Alles in I K 15.23 Geschilderte geht am jüngsten Tag, am Tag des Herrn, vor sich, der freilich kein Tag von 24 Stunden ist." (As cited by Leivestad, op. cit., p. 134).

¹³Cf. Robertson and Plummer, First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, p. 354.

Third, the claim that τὸ τέλος can be interpreted as "the rest of the dead" seems weak, especially so in light of the fact that Weiss and Lietzmann have shown only two instances when it has this meaning. Jean Héring has examined both of these passages (Isa. 19:15 and Aristotle's De generatione animalium 1.18) and has shown that the Isaianic reference actually means 'end,' and the Aristotelean passage has a teleological meaning.¹⁴ Thus, in the words of Moffatt, it seems "too remote and ambiguous" to support the hypothesis of two resurrections on such evidence.¹⁵ Indeed, one would think that Paul would have defined the term more clearly if τὸ τέλος has such an unusual meaning here. Héring argues further that if Paul has in mind a third τύπος at all it is in reference to the transformation of the living Christians at the time of the general resurrection.¹⁶ He concludes by saying that Paul does not refer to the transformation of the living in I Corinthians 15:24 as a third τύπος of resurrection because they are not actually raised from the dead, but rather are changed.¹⁷ Thus, in conclusion as to the true significance of

¹⁴"Saint Paul a-t-il enseigné deux résurrections?" R.H.P.R., 1932, pp. 304-306.

¹⁵The First Epistle to the Corinthians, p. 248.

¹⁶Op. cit., pp. 304-306. He draws this conclusion by interpreting I Cor. 15:23-24 in light of the three orders in I Thess. 4:16-17, viz., (1) the appearance of Christ (which naturally presupposes His resurrection), (2) the resurrection of deceased Christians, and (3) the transformation of living believers (pp. 306 f.). Cf. also Héring's La première épître de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens (Commentaire du Nouveau Testament. VII), (Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé S. A., 1948), p. 140.

¹⁷"Saint Paul a-t-il enseigné deux résurrections?" op. cit., pp. 306 f.

$\tau\acute{o}$ $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, Davies' view seems most satisfying: " $\tau\acute{o}$ $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ is a technical phrase denoting the final consummation," and should be translated "the end."¹⁸ These rebuttals seem to demonstrate definitely that there is not sufficient reason for believing that Paul held to a two-resurrection hypothesis with an intervening Messianic Kingdom.¹⁹

In addition to these specific reasons for not holding to a two-

¹⁸Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 295. So also Stephens, The Pauline Theology, pp. 352 ff. F. C. Burkitt, "On I Corinthians XV 26," J.T.S., XVII (1916), pp. 384-385, and K. Barth, The Resurrection of the Dead, pp. 171 f., maintain that $\tau\acute{o}$ $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ is to be taken adverbially as meaning "finally," and they find the climax of the passage in the fact that death is put down as the last enemy. Davies (Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 294) holds that "this interpretation of $\tau\acute{o}$ $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ cannot be accepted because it obviously makes what is mentioned almost in parenthesis, namely, the abolition of death, of paramount significance for the understanding of the passage." While these scholars may disagree as to the precise interpretation of $\tau\acute{o}$ $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, they do seem to be in basic agreement in regard to the greater issue, that is, that the phrase does not lend support to a two-resurrection hypothesis.

¹⁹In his criticism of Schweitzer's view, Neill Q. Hamilton (op. cit., pp. 47 f.) says: "It seems to me that here we come upon the weakest part of Dr Schweitzer's exposition of Paul, namely in the claim that the Apostle held to two Resurrections, a Messianic and a General, and to two corresponding blessednesses, a temporary and an eternal. Paul is supposed to be the creator of this doctrine of two Resurrections. In support of this Dr Schweitzer cites I Cor. 15.50-3 but has to admit at once that 'so far as the wording goes, Paul might have been speaking of the resurrection of the dead in general.' Then how do we know that two resurrections are intended behind the wording? Dr Schweitzer says, by consulting I Thess. 4.16 and I Cor. 15.23. But neither of these mention two resurrections. Then where did Dr Schweitzer get the idea? We have to do here with an over-enthusiasm for the rôle which eschatological problems played in the development of Paul's thoughts. It is an exaggeration to say that 'the first and most immediate problem' of the Christian faith 'was the temporal separation of the Resurrection and Return of Jesus Christ,' and that Paul's whole system of thoughts is an endeavour to answer this single problem."

resurrection hypothesis there is a far greater general objection. The theory presumes that the reign of Christ after the parousia is an eschatological necessity because this is the time when Christ will be engaged in His protracted struggle to overcome the powers of evil, and thus usher in the eternal Kingdom of God. While it is outside the scope of this thesis to deal exhaustively with the subject of the Messianic reign of Christ and the final consummation, suffice it to say that the evidence is positive that Paul thought of the new age as having already begun at Christ's resurrection and exaltation, as we have seen above.²⁰

G. Vos maintains that Paul thinks of the present Christian state on such a high plane that to represent it as followed by some intermediate condition falling short of the perfect heavenly life would be an anti-climax to Paul's teachings.²¹

. . . Paul throughout represents the present Christian life as so directly leading up to, so thoroughly pre-fashioning the life of the eternal world, that the assumption of a tertium quid separating the

²⁰Vide supra pp. 144 ff. Cf. Hering, "Saint Paul a-t-il enseigné deux résurrections?" op. cit., pp. 312 f., La première épître de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens, p. 141; John Bright, The Kingdom of God in Bible and Church (London: Lutterworth Press, 1955), pp. 235-244; Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 295 ff.; Charles, A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life, p. 448. The analysis of these interpreters leads one to the conclusion that the Kingdom of Christ has already begun at His resurrection, and that the vanquishing of all enemies is taking place in the period between the resurrection and the consummation. Cf. Cullmann, "The Kingship of Christ and the Church in the New Testament," The Early Church, pp. 109-120, who holds the present millennium as the final phase of the Kingdom of Christ which began at the Ascension. Bietenhard holds a view similar to Cullmann's--see Leivestad, op. cit., p. 134.

²¹"The Pauline Eschatology and Chiliasm," op. cit., p. 34.

one from the other must be regarded as destructive to the inner organism of his eschatology. For it will be observed that what the Christian life anticipates is according to the above survey, in each case something of an absolute nature, something pertaining to the consummate state. No matter with what concrete elements or colors the conception of a Chiliastic state may be filled out, to a mind thus nourished upon the first-fruits of eternal life itself, it can, for the very reason that it must fall short of eternal life, have neither significance nor attraction.²²

Thus it is that in the mind of many scholars the concept of a millennial reign of Christ after the parousia seems superfluous to Paul's thought.

Otto Michel points out that in Judaism the concept of a temporary Messianic Kingdom was a necessary auxiliary utilized by the apocalyptists in their attempt to equalize the great tension they felt between their earthly experience and their theoretic knowledge of a transcendent God.²³ He thinks that this "auxiliary" became unnecessary for Paul, who had met the exalted Lord, because the tension between the present world and the eternal God was bridged by the presently reigning and glorified Christ. "Bei Paulus ist diese Spannung überwunden, weil er dem erhöhten Christus begegnet ist und sein Denken aus dem Glauben schöpft."²⁴ Even scholars such as Schweitzer and Weiss, who claim the view of a future millennial reign, have to acknowledge the fact that Paul thought of the Messianic reign of Christ as having begun at His resurrection and exaltation.²⁵

²²Ibid., p. 35.

²³"Der Christus des Paulus," Z.N.T.W., XXXI (1933), Heft 1, p. 12. Cf. also Althaus, op. cit., pp. 307-317.

²⁴"Der Christus des Paulus," op. cit., p. 12.

²⁵Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, pp. 98 ff.; Weiss,

Paul conceives of Christ's struggle to overcome the powers of evil as beginning at the cross, resurrection, and exaltation, and ending with the final battle in which death is overcome (I Cor. 15:25, 26). This final battle may be equated in time with the occasion of the final resurrection of Christians (and the transformation of living believers) because it is just after his reference to this event (I Cor. 15:25) that the Apostle says that death is destroyed (vs. 26), and in Philipians 3:21 he identifies the power that effects this transformation with the power with which Christ subjects all things to Himself. Kennedy observes:

Obviously, this final destruction of death is revealed by the event of the Resurrection, when the redeemed of the Lord prove by their rising that they also are stronger than death--that the indwelling might of the *HYEÜM* of Christ has vanquished the darkness of the grave. Thus, in our judgment, the argument to be drawn from St Paul's own words is decisive against a protracted struggle between Christ and His adversaries after the Parousia.²⁶

In conclusion, it would seem that the struggle with evil ends, not begins, at the parousia, and that the idea of a millennial reign is an unnecessary appendage affixed to Paul's eschatological thinking. We find no adequate foundation anywhere in the Apostle's epistles for the building of a two-resurrection theory with an intervening Messianic Kingdom.

The History of Primitive Christianity, I, pp. 34 f., Vol. II, pp. 446 f.

²⁶ St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things, p. 330. Dr. Barnes, op. cit., p. 111, makes the statement: "The claim that Paul taught a millennial reign of Christ after the parousia is inconsistent with the apostle's conception of the final resurrection as the power whereby Christ deals the final blow to the powers of evil, it is superfluous to his faith in the exalted Lord, and it is cancelled out by his realized eschatology."

VI: THE GENERAL RESURRECTION

Because the final resurrection is based on the believers' faith in Christ and His resurrection, it is not surprising that Paul has so little to say about a resurrection of the unjust, or a general resurrection for all people. In the light of this, and especially because of Paul's conception of the resurrection body (which would seem to leave no room for a resurrection of those outside of Christ),¹ some interpreters have concluded that Paul never once states that non-believers will be raised.²

In connection with this problem, Hering thinks that the resurrection of the non-elect would serve no purpose because they are condemned to annihilation, and that the difference between the elect and non-elect (which would be the only reason for their resurrection) is already realized by the fact that they do not rise with the elect at the parousia.³ Thus

¹Vide supra pp. 229 ff.

²For example, R. H. Charles says that according to Paul's view there can be no resurrection of the wicked, and he thinks that Paul's statement in Acts 24:15 ("there will be a resurrection of both the just and the unjust") does not represent an "accurate report" of the Apostle's view. See Charles, A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life, p. 386. Several scholars share Charles' view. Cf. Macintyre, The Other Side of Death, p. 187; Beasley Murray, "The New Testament Doctrine of the End," The Evangelical Quarterly, XVI, No. 3 (July, 1944), p. 209; McGiffert, op. cit., pp. 454 f.; Stevens, The Pauline Theology, p. 357, note 1. H. J. Cadbury, in speaking of Acts 24:15, says: "Paul is here quoted as having a faith in God that there is to be resurrection of both the just and the unjust. The context suggests that this view is what accords with the law and with what is written in the prophets, and also that it was the expectation of his Jewish accusers themselves" ("Acts and Eschatology," B.N.T.I.E., p. 312).

³Cf. M. Goguel, "Le caractère, à la fois actuel et futur, du salut

their very absence would sufficiently reveal their doom, and he feels that this is why Paul never mentions a general resurrection. This view, however, hardly seems in keeping with the doctrine of a universal judgment, which almost all scholars agree that Paul taught (cf. Rom. 2:5-12, 14:10; II Cor. 5:10). Hence Goguel's reply in reference to Hering's view seems appropriate: "Qu'est-ce qu'un jugement qui ne comporte pas la possibilité d'une condamnation?"⁴

The Resurrection To Include All

The majority of scholars agree that the New Testament concept of the last judgment presupposes the general resurrection.⁵ They assume that the Apostle's view of resurrection does include the raising of those outside Christ to face their judgment of eternal destruction.⁶ This would

dans la théologie paulinienne," B.N.T.I.E., p. 334, where the author considers Hering's view. Goguel refers to Hering's work, Le Royaume de Dieu et sa venue d'après Jésus et d'après l'apôtre Paul. Cf. also Leivestad, op. cit., in note on p. 132: "... it should be possible to pass judgment on the dead without assuming a literal resurrection."

⁴"Le caractère, à la fois actuel et futur, du salut dans la théologie paulinienne," op. cit., p. 334.

⁵Cf. John A. T. Robinson, In the End, God, pp. 81 f.: "All men will be raised; the relationship with God which makes humanity human is indestructible. But for that very reason all will be raised to a life-in-relationship, to a life from which no escape from God is possible. And for some that will be heaven, and for some that will be hell."

⁶See H. A. Guy, op. cit., p. 116; Kennedy, St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things, pp. 275 f.; Paul Althaus, op. cit., pp. 115 f.; W. Morgan, op. cit., pp. 231; Floyd V. Filson, St. Paul's Conception of Recompense, in Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, Heft 21 (1931), pp. 24 f., 79.

involve some sort of a return of the unbelievers to a state in which God's sentence of retribution may be made effective. Althaus says that while Paul speaks of a resurrection to eternal life, he assumes as well a common resurrection, though he does not teach it directly.⁷ Thus, in Althaus' understanding of the Apostle's teaching, there are two resurrections; one for the judgment and another for eternal life. The resurrection of the believers to eternal life through the Spirit of Christ is different from the mere resurrection of the dead.⁸

In further support of the view of a general resurrection Floyd V. Filson has pointed out (in his doctoral thesis) that I Corinthians 15:22 has reference to a universal resurrection.⁹ He shows that verse 22 does not teach a doctrine of universal salvation; nor does Paul refer just to the resurrection of Christians. As argument against the view that the Apostle is thinking only of the resurrection of Christians, Filson gives the following two reasons:

One [reason] is that the contrast of v. 21 is clearly that between physical death and bodily resurrection without reference to final destiny. The other is that in vv. 23-28 reference is made not only to the resurrection of Christians (v. 23) but also to that of all others, (vv. 24ff.). Hence *ἡ ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν* is to be taken in

⁷Op. cit., p. 116.

⁸Ibid. For his conclusion Althaus quotes Luther: "'Ich glaub, dass da zukünftig ist eine Auferstehung der Toten, in welcher durch denselben Heiligen Geist wird wieder auferweckt werden alles Fleisch, das ist: all Menschen nach dem Fleisch, Fromme und Böse.'" (p. 116).

⁹St. Paul's Conception of Recompense, op. cit., pp. 23 f.

the simple sense of bodily resurrection, a usage similar to that of 15:36, and *ἐν Χριστῷ* refers to Christ's connection with all mankind in bringing them to life for the final judgment. But the judgment idea is not developed. Paul's purpose was merely to prove to his readers the reality of resurrection and he has done it by showing all men will rise.¹⁰

In pointing this truth out Filson is careful to distinguish between a universal resurrection and the ultimate fate of the wicked. Paul refers to the universal resurrection without pausing to speak of the fate of the wicked.¹¹ In our opinion, Filson's understanding of verse 22 is one of few interpretations that do justice to the contextual reference to general resurrection (vss. 21, 23 f.) without ignoring Paul's clearly expressed expectation that some men will be condemned at the judgment.¹² Thus while Paul usually thinks only of Christians when he mentions the resurrection, this does not mean that he denies the resurrection of others, but simply that in his discussion he does not elaborate upon the resurrection of the wicked. In conclusion, the most feasible conclusion seems to be that Paul does think of a general resurrection occurring at the parousia, and that those outside of Christ are raised in a body appropriate to the final judgment passed upon them.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 24.

¹¹Ibid., p. 79.

¹²This view is in agreement with Paul's reported statement in Acts 24:15: "... there will be a resurrection of both the just and the unjust."

VII: CONCLUSION

The final resurrection brings to completion the order of resurrection which began with Christ's resurrection, and it is the natural unfolding of the present rising with Christ which believers have already experienced. The present possession of the Spirit (who was the active agent in the resurrection of Christ and in bringing about the believers' present rising with Christ) is the assurance of the future resurrection of the dead. The believer will be raised in a spiritual body (similar to Christ's resurrection body)--a body of a wholly new nature from that which died and was buried. And yet while this glorious body is distinct from its mortal counterparts, it is inherently one with the former. The body of mortality must be transformed into a spiritual body which will be appropriate for its future redeemed state with Christ; hence the necessity of a resurrection. This transformation, though perhaps illustrated in nature by a seed sown and the new plant, cannot be fully understood by man--it is an act of God.

While Paul's conception of the resurrection body does not undergo any radical changes in II Corinthians 5, this passage does reflect a growth in the Apostle's understanding. However, it is not necessary to explain this growth as the Hellenization of Paul's thought. The passage reveals the Apostle's earnest longing to acquire the spiritual body as soon as possible, if possible without even dying. But in the event of his death before the parousia he has the assurance of continuing "in

Christ" even during this imperfect intermediate state. In any case Paul has the guarantee that he, along with all believers, will be raised at the coming of Christ. While there is no ground in the Apostle's writings for a two-resurrection hypothesis with an intervening Messianic kingdom, it does seem probable that Paul thought of a general resurrection at the parousia when all are raised for the final judgment.

PART V

GENERAL SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

GENERAL SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

"If Christ has not been raised, then our preaching is in vain and your faith is in vain" (I Cor. 15:14). This apostolic declaration could be written as a motto on the first page of any account of Christian doctrine because the resurrection was fundamental and central for the New Testament Christianity. The resurrection faith meant more than the fact that Jesus had been raised from the dead; it expressed certain feelings and experiences, a definite state of mind and of life. This is why it had the power to give birth to the Christian faith. As such, the belief that Christ was raised from the dead did not grow-up or develop in the church; rather it gave rise to the church.

The resurrection changed the dispirited disciples into the founders of the church triumphant; the power of the Risen Lord laid hold upon them. To be sure, we cannot understand how it happened; nor can our Gospels explain it. Indeed, as J. S. Whale has said, it is the resurrection which alone explains the Gospels.¹ "Here is the mightiest of the mighty acts of God, foreign to the common experience of man, inscrutable to all his science, astounding to believers, and unbelievers alike."² But inexplicable and inscrutable as it may be, it alone explains the Christian Gospel, Christian history and experience.

¹J. S. Whale, Christian Doctrine (Cambridge: University Press, 1941), p. 73.

²Ibid.

The resurrection is not an isolated event because it is implicit in the gospel story from the very beginning. In truth, the church's witness to the resurrection is attested by her whole life--her hymns, prayers, sermons, Scriptures, ordinances, her first Christian festival (Easter), indeed by the lives, martyrdoms and funerals of her members. It is not tacked on to the gospel story as an appendage to make a happy ending, or to hide what, without it, would be the supreme tragedy of history. Hence the resurrection cannot be taken away from Christianity without radically altering its character and destroying its very nature.³ As we have seen, the resurrection was the burden of the disciples' preaching, the interpretative principle of their theology, and with this key every lock once closed flew open.

The Christological Significance of the Resurrection

The appearances of the Risen Jesus rallied the disciples, restored their confidence, and gave them their message to proclaim. As the climactic event in their Redeemer's life, the resurrection caused them to re-interpret the Person of Jesus. His passion and death were understood as prophesied, and because of Jesus' complete obedience, the Father did not permit Him to see corruption. The scandal of the cross was removed and they now saw Him as the Christ, the Messiah, who was exalted by God (Acts 2:36). In his Damascus experience the Apostle Paul discovered the Risen Jesus as the Messiah, and while he shared the primitive church's Messianic claim for

³Ibid., p. 69; cf. p. 73.

Jesus, he at the same time saw the Christ in a broader perspective. Christ was not simply a Jewish Messiah but much more--a world Redeemer--who was reigning and who was given power to overcome all evil (I Cor. 15: 25 f.; Phil. 2:10 f.). While Jesus did not try to conceal His Messiahship from His disciples, He was reticent about its public proclamation because of the people's misunderstanding. The intimate disciples did look upon Jesus as the Messiah, but this is not to say that this belief gave rise to their reasoning that He must have been raised. They began with the resurrection and saw in it the vindication of their Messianic faith.

So also the Risen Jesus was thought of as "Lord," a title which was more understandable to the Gentiles than that of "Christ." While it is true that the title *Kurios* was common in the Hellenistic world, its use in early Christianity makes it improbable that the disciples borrowed the title from paganism; rather its transference to Christ had been prepared within Judaism. No longer was "Lord" a mere title of respect as it had been during Jesus' earthly ministry. This post-resurrection designation has reference, especially in the Apostle Paul's thought, to the intense devotion of the disciples to One who was now reigning and all powerful. As such the title stands for an attitude toward Christ rather than any "cultic" doctrine or dogma. Particularly significant is the constant use of the title in the worship of the primitive church. For example, the disciples met for worship on the "Lord's Day," the first day of the week (Acts 20:7; I Cor. 16:2), which was the memorialization of their Lord's resurrection. They were baptized in the name of the Lord (Acts 2:38; 8:16).

and because Christ had been exalted as Lord, prayer was now addressed directly to Him (I Cor. 16:22). Thus too, the Lord's Supper is to be related to the resurrection because its celebration was closely tied up with the post-resurrection meals which the Risen Lord had shared with His disciples. Some of the most striking attributes which had been associated with Yahweh in the Old Testament were now ascribed to Christ. Of all the designations of the Risen One, "Lord" played an outstanding rôle in the Apostles' estimate of His Person.

Christ's Sonship was re-appraised by Paul in that while Christ was thought of as the pre-existent and eternal Son, His resurrection openly proclaimed Him as the Son of God "in power" (Rom. 1:4). The inherent glory of His Sonship was now made manifest and He had power over that which formerly had power over Him. Although Jesus' Sonship had been proclaimed by the whole of His ministry, few had been able to recognize Him as such, but now the whole of mankind were under obligation to acknowledge it.

As Adam was the head and representative of the first humanity, Christ, by virtue of His resurrection and exaltation, became the Last Adam. As the Last Adam the Risen Lord is author and perfecter of the new aeon and of the new redeemed humanity; He is a life-giving spirit (I Cor. 15:45). The Apostle Paul's contrast between Christ and Adam is really a contrast between two different orders of existence; one under the dominion of death, the other under the dominion of life. By His death and resurrection Christ challenged the right of sin and death to rule over Adam's world. He invaded Adam's

world, conquered it, and made it His own; hence Adam is subordinate to Christ.

The Soteriological Significance of the Resurrection

Apart from the primary significance of the resurrection in giving Christ life, power, and majesty, the resurrection has vital importance for the salvation of the church in that it opened the way for Christ to work in the lives of believers. Thus while the resurrection moves backwards in bringing Christ back to life and in giving His earthly ministry God's seal of approval, it moves forward in opening the door for new and greater activity on behalf of the Risen Lord. Indeed, the resurrection is to be viewed as the starting-point in understanding the work of Christ, because while the cross (the culmination of Christ's work) is central in the Christian faith it has to be seen in light of the resurrection.

In His resurrection and exaltation Christ was freed from the limitations of His earthly ministry, and as a manifestation of His new sovereign power He sends the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:33). The Spirit is indissolubly linked with the interest and activity of the Risen Christ in that He operates in the lives of the believers to bring about a fellowship between the Risen Christ and His followers (Rom. 6:5-11) and to anticipate the final resurrection, the supreme revelation (Rom. 8:23; Eph. 1:13, 14; Gal. 3:14). This activity is seen particularly in baptism and the Lord's Supper.

So also the resurrection plays a rôle in our justification because justification becomes an accomplished fact only through Christ's rising again (Rom. 4:25). Christ's resurrection was the necessary antecedent of

His applying to His disciples the virtues of the atonement which His death had made possible. As such, justification is inseparably linked with both the death and resurrection of Christ. In addition, we see that the fact of Christ's resurrection is more than the assurance that His followers will likewise be raised at the parousia; the power of the resurrection is a present reality, a source of a new life in this age. It is an eschatological event brought into the present. In baptism the believer dies with Christ, he rises with Him, and being in Christ, he becomes one with the Risen Lord (Rom. 6:3 ff.). This communion with Christ is further evidenced in the Lord's Supper which in the main looks back to the post-resurrection meals which Christ shared with the disciples (Acts 10:41). The Supper expresses the exuberant joy which is characteristic of the Meal as the anticipation of the marriage feast of the Lamb. The resurrection of believers is linked with that of Jesus in that the believers are risen-along-with Christ as a manifestation of the power of His resurrection. In his thinking of a present resurrection the Apostle Paul was probably influenced by the early church, and undoubtedly by his own experience in encountering the Risen Christ.

The Eschatological Significance of the Resurrection

The apostolic witness to the resurrection is par excellence an eschatological one, because while the resurrection had meaning for Christ Himself, for believers in the present age, it was most often thought of as the future and final triumph of God in overcoming death. The final resurrection brings to completion the order of resurrection which began with

Christ's resurrection. Christ is the first-fruit of the harvest and thus there is a vital relationship between Christ's resurrection and that of believers. This close relationship is seen in the fact that the same Spirit who was the active agent of Christ's resurrection is to accomplish the resurrection of the dead. The present possession of the Spirit is the assurance of the future resurrection.

The nature of this resurrection body is to be patterned after that of Christ. It is not a resuscitated earthly body, or merely an immortal spirit, but a transformed and glorified body. This spiritual body is distinct from its mortal counterparts, yet inherently one with it as its continuation. The natural body must be transformed into the spiritual before it can inherit the Kingdom. This process of transformation is comparable to that in nature when a seed is sown and the plant comes forth from the seed; it is related to the seed but vastly different. The background of Paul's concept of the spiritual body is found in the thoughts of some of the better Jewish thinkers, but most important is the Apostle's Damascus encounter with the Risen Lord. Paul speaks of the resurrection body in both I Corinthians 15 and II Corinthians 5. While II Corinthians 5 reflects new thoughts on the resurrection body, one should not overlook the parallel ideas as well. One cannot justifiably say that the Apostle has radically altered his earlier views as represented by I Corinthians 15, nor that his earlier views have been vastly influenced by Hellenism.

The believer who dies in Christ is still with the Lord (I Thess. 4: 16), and no power, not even death, is able to break the Christian's union

with Christ. This does not mean, as some maintain, that the believer receives his resurrection body at death; rather, the Apostle teaches that the spiritual body is acquired for all believers at the same time, i. e., at the parousia. II Corinthians 5 reveals Paul's earnest longing to acquire the spiritual body as soon as possible--without even dying, if possible. But in the event that he does die before the parousia he has the assurance of continuing in Christ even during this imperfect intermediate state.

There is no clear reason to believe that the Apostle believed that there would be two separate resurrections, with an intervening Messianic Kingdom. Paul thought of the new age as having already begun at Christ's resurrection and exaltation, and the thought of a millennial reign of Christ after the parousia seems superfluous to his thought. It seems highly probable that Paul believed that all, both the righteous and unrighteous, would be raised at the general resurrection in connection with their judgment.

Our study has shown us that from the very beginning the doctrine of the resurrection was of central and fundamental importance for Christian preaching--both from the standpoint of its being a part of the kerygma and as the interpretative factor of other aspects of the kerygma. It sprang suddenly into existence and spread irresistibly over the whole body of disciples. While the earliest apostles preached the resurrection and began to re-evaluate the Person of Christ in its light, it was left largely to the Apostle Paul to enrich and develop the fuller understanding of this mighty act of God.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Abbott, Edwin A. The Message of the Son of Man. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1909.
- Althaus, Paul. Die Letzten Dinge: Lehrbuch der Eschatologie. Fünfte Auflage. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1949.
- Andrews, Elias. The Meaning of Christ For Paul. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949.
- Arnold, Matthew. St. Paul and Protestantism. London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1892.
- Arseniew, Nicholas. Mysticism and the Eastern Church. Trans. by Arthur Chambers. London: Student Christian Movement, 1926.
- _____. We Beheld His Glory: The Primitive Christian Message and Present-Day Religious Trends. Trans. by Mary Anita Ewer. London: Society For Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1937.
- Aulén, Gustaf. Christus Victor. Trans. by A. G. Hebert. London: Society For Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1931.
- _____. The Faith of the Christian Church. Trans. by Eric H. Wahlstrom and G. Everett Arden. Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1948.
- Bacon, Benjamin Wisner. The Founding of the Church. London: Constable & Co. Ltd., 1919.
- _____. Jesus the Son of God or Primitive Christology. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1911.
- Baillie, D. M. God Was In Christ. 2nd Edition. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1955.
- Baldensperger, G. Le Tombeau Vide: La Légende et L'histoire. Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan, 1935.
- Barling, T. J. Dare We Believe. Birmingham: The Christadelphians, [1951].
- Barnes, Ernest William. The Rise of Christianity. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1947.

- Barrett, C. K. The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition. London: Society For Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1947.
- Barth, Karl. Christ And Adam. Trans. by T. A. Smail. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1956.
- _____. Credo. Trans. by J. Strathearn McNab. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1936.
- _____. Church Dogmatics. Ed. by G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. Vol. I, Part 2: The Doctrine of the Word of God, trans. by G. T. Thomson and Harold Knight, 1956. Vol. II, First half-vol.: The Doctrine of God, trans. by T. H. L. Parker et al., 1957. Vol. IV, Part I: The Doctrine of Reconciliation, trans. by G. W. Bromiley, 1956.
- _____. Dogmatics In Outline. Trans. by G. T. Thomson. London: S.C.M. Press, 1949.
- _____. The Resurrection of the Dead. Trans. by H. J. Stenning. London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1933.
- Barth, Markus. Der Augenzeuge: Eine Untersuchung über die Wahrnehmung des Menschensohnes durch die Apostel. Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag Ag. Zollikon, 1946.
- Bartlet, J. V. The Apostolic Age. 2 Vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950.
- Bell, G. K. A., and Adolf Deissmann (eds.). Mysterium Christi. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1930.
- Best, Ernest. One Body In Christ. London: S.P.C.K., 1955.
- Beyschlag, Willibald. New Testament Theology. Trans. by Neil Buchanan. 2 Vols. 2nd Edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1896.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. Jesus der Herr. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1916.
- _____. Kyrios Christos. Zweite Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921.
- Bowen, Clayton R. The Resurrection in the New Testament. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1911.
- Bowman, John W. The Intention of Jesus. London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1945.

- Briggs, Charles A. The Messiah of the Apostles. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895.
- _____. New Light on the Life of Jesus. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1904.
- Bright, John. The Kingdom of God in Bible and Church. London: Lutterworth Press, 1955.
- Brunner, Emil. Eternal Hope. Trans. by Harold Knight. London: Lutterworth Press, 1954.
- _____. The Mediator. Trans. by Olive Wyon. London: Lutterworth Press, 1934.
- _____. The Scandal of Christianity. London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1951.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. Theology of the New Testament. Trans. by Kendrick Grobel. 2 Vols. London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1952.
- Buren, Paul van, Christ In Our Place: The Substitutionary Character of Calvin's Doctrine of Reconciliation. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.
- Burkitt, F. C. Christian Beginnings. London: University of London Press, Ltd., 1924.
- Burney, C. F. The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922.
- Caird, G. B. The Apostolic Age. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1955.
- Carpenter, Edward. That Man Paul. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1953.
- Carrington, Philip. The Early Christian Church. 2 Vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1957.
- Case, Shirley Jackson. The Evolution of Early Christianity. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1914.
- _____. The Historicity of Jesus. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1912.
- _____. Jesus Through The Centuries. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1932.
- Cave, Sydney. The Gospel of St. Paul. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1928.

- Charles, R. H. A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity. 2nd Edition. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1913.
- _____. Immortality. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912.
- _____. The Resurrection of Man and Other Sermons. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1929.
- Chase, F. H. The Gospels in the Light of Historical Criticism. London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1914.
- Clemen, Carl. Paulus: sein Leben und Wirken. 2 Vols. Giessen: J. Ricker'sche, 1904.
- Cullmann, Oscar. Baptism in the New Testament (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 1). Trans. by J. K. S. Reid. London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1950.
- _____. Christ and Time. Trans. by Floyd V. Filson. London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1951.
- _____. Earliest Christian Confessions. Trans. by J. K. S. Reid. London: Lutterworth Press, 1949.
- _____. Early Christian Worship (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 10). Trans. by A. Stewart Todd and James B. Torrance. London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1953.
- Dalman, Gustaf. Der leidende und sterbende Messias der Synagoge in ersten Nachchristlichen Jahrtausend. Berlin: [n.n.], 1888.
- _____. The Words of Jesus. Trans. by D. M. Kay. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902.
- Darrah, John T. The Resurrection of the Flesh. London: Society For Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1921.
- Davies, W. D. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. 2nd Edition. London: S.P.C.K., 1955.
- Davies, W. D., and D. Daube (eds.). The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology. Cambridge: University Press, 1956.
- Deissmann, Adolf. Light From the Ancient East. Trans. by Lionel R. M. Strachan. London: Hodder and Staughton, 1910.
- _____. Die neutestamentliche Formel 'in Christo Jesu'. Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche, 1892.

- _____. Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History. Trans. by William E. Wilson. 2nd Ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1926.
- _____. The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul. Trans. by William E. Wilson. London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1923.
- Denney, James. Jesus and the Gospel. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908.
- Dibelius, Martin. Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1909.
- _____. Gospel Criticism and Christology. London: Ivor Nicholson & Watson, 1935.
- _____. Paul. Edited and Completed by Werner Georg Kümmel. Trans. by Frank Clarke. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1953.
- Dobschütz, E. von. The Apostolic Age. Trans. by F. L. Pogson. London: Philip Green, 1909.
- Dodd, C. H. According to the Scriptures. London: Nisbet & Co., Ltd., 1952.
- _____. The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments. New Ed. London: Hodder & Stoughton, Ltd., 1944.
- _____. The Bible and the Greeks. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935.
- _____. History and the Gospel. London: Nisbet & Co. Ltd., 1938.
- Duncan, George S. Jesus, Son of Man. London: Nisbet & Co. Ltd., 1947.
- Edersheim, Alfred. Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. 2 Vols. Rev. Ed. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1900.
- Edgar, R. M'Cheyne. The Gospel of a Risen Saviour. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1892.
- Edwards, T. C. The God-Man. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1895.
- Ellis, E. Earle. Paul's Use of the Old Testament. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.
- Enslin, Morton Scott. The Ethics of Paul. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1930.
- Filson, Floyd V. Jesus Christ The Risen Lord. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956.

- _____. The New Testament Against Its Environment (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 3). London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1950.
- _____. St. Paul's Conception of Recompense (Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, Hoft 21, 1931, Herausgegeben von H. Windisch). Leipzig: J. C. Hindrichs'sche Buchhandlung. 6/
- Fison, J. E. The Christian Hope: The Presence and the Parousia. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1954.
- Fuller, Reginald H. The Mission and Achievement of Jesus. London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1954.
- Gardner, Percy. The Religious Experience of Saint Paul. London: Williams & Norgate, 1911.
- Garvie, Alfred E. Studies of Paul and His Gospel. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1911.
- George, A. Raymond. Communion With God in the New Testament. London: The Epworth Press, 1953.
- Goguel, Maurice. L'Apôtre Paul et Jésus-Christ. Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1904.
- _____. The Birth of Christianity. Trans. by H. C. Snape. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1953.
- _____. La Foi a la Résurrection de Jésus dans le Christianisme Primitif. Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux, 1933.
- _____. Jesus the Nazarene--Myth or History? Trans. by Frederick Stephens. London: T. Fisher Unwin Ltd., 1926.
- _____. The Life of Jesus. Trans. by Olive Wyon. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1933.
- Gore, Charles. Belief In God. London: John Murray, 1921.
- Graetz, H. History of the Jews. Ed. and in part trans. by Bella Löwy. 5 Vols. London: David Nutt, 1891.
- Grant, Frederick C. The Earliest Gospel. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1943.
- _____. An Introduction to New Testament Thought. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950.

- Guignebert, Ch. Jesus. Trans. by S. H. Hooke. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., 1935.
- Guy, H. A. The New Testament Doctrine of 'Last Things'. London: Oxford University Press, 1948.
- Hamilton, Neill Q. The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul (Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers, No. 6). Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd Ltd., 1957.
- Hardman, Oscar. The Resurrection of the Body. London: Society For Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1934.
- Harnack, Adolf. Die Chronologie Der Altchristlichen Litteratur Bis Eusebius. 2 Vols. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche, 1897.
- _____. The Date of the Acts and of The Synoptic Gospels. Trans. by J. R. Wilkinson. London: Williams & Norgate, 1911.
- Heim, Karl. The Church of Christ and the Problems of the Day. London: Nisbet and Co. Ltd., 1936.
- Héring, Jean. Le Royaume de Dieu et sa venue: Étude sur L'espérance de Jesus et de L'apôtre Paul. Paris. Librairie Felix Alcan, 1937.
- Higgins, A. J. B. The Lord's Supper in the New Testament (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 6). London: SCM Press Ltd., 1952.
- Holtrop, Harmen. De Verschijningen Onzes Heeren te Jeruzalem en in Galilea. Amsterdam: S. J. P. Bakker, 1947.
- Holtzmann, Oscar. The Life of Jesus. Trans. by J. T. Bealby and M. A. Canney. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1904.
- Hopwood, P. G. S. The Religious Experience of the Primitive Church. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936.
- Hunter, A. M. Introducing New Testament Theology. London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1957.
- _____. Paul and His Predecessors. London: Nicholson and Watson, 1940.
- _____. The Unity of the New Testament. London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1943.
- Jalland, T. G. The Origin and Evolution of the Christian Church. London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1948.

- Jocz, Jakób. The Jewish People and Jesus Christ: A Study in the Relationship between the Jewish People and Jesus Christ. London: S.P.C.K., 1949.
- Johnston, George. The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament. Cambridge: University Press, 1943.
- Jones, Geraint Vaughan. Christology and Myth in the New Testament. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1956.
- Jülicher, Adolph. Neue Linien in der Kritik der evangelischen Überlieferung. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1906.
- Kabisch, Rich. Die Eschatologie des Paulus. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1893.
- Kautsky, Karl. Foundations of Christianity: A Study in Christian Origins. Trans. from the 13th German Ed. [no translator]. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1925.
- Kennedy, H. A. A. St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1913.
- _____. St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1904.
- Klausner, Joseph. From Jesus to Paul. Trans. by William F. Stinespring. London: Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1942.
- _____. Jesus of Nazareth. Trans. by Herbert Danby. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1925.
- _____. The Messianic Idea in Israel. Trans. from the 3rd Hebrew Ed. by W. F. Stinespring. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1956.
- Knowling, R. J. The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ. 2nd Ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1906.
- Knox, John. Chapters in a Life of Paul. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1954.
- _____. Christ The Lord: The Meaning of Jesus in the Early Church. Chicago: Willett, Clark & Co., 1945.
- _____. Criticism and Faith. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1953.
- _____. The Early Church and the Coming Great Church. London: Epworth Press, 1957.

- Knox, Wilfred L. St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles. Cambridge: University Press, 1939.
- _____. St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem. Cambridge: University Press, 1925.
- Kohler, Kaufmann. The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929.
- Künneth, Walter. Theologie der Auferstehung. 2nd and 4th Eds. München: Claudius Verlag, 1934 (2nd Ed.), 1951 (4th Ed.).
- Lake, Kirsopp. The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. London: Williams & Norgate, 1907.
- _____. Landmarks in the History of Early Christianity. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1920.
- _____. The Stewardship of Faith. London: Christophers, 1915.
- Latham, Henry. Pastor Pastorum. Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1905.
- _____. The Risen Master. Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Son, 1901.
- Leivestad, Ragnar. Christ the Conqueror. London: S.P.C.K., 1954.
- Leuba, Jean-Louis. New Testament Pattern. Trans. by Harold Knight. London: Lutterworth Press, 1953.
- Lietzmann, Hans. The Beginnings of the Christian Church. Revised. Trans. by Betram Lee Woolf. London: Lutterworth Press, 1949.
- _____. Mass and Lord's Supper: A Study in the History of the Liturgy. Translation, with appendices, by Dorothea H. G. Reeve, introduction and supplementary essay by Robert Douglas Richardson. 4 Fascicles. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953-[not completed].
- _____. Messe und Herrenmahl: Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Liturgie. Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Weber's Verlag, 1926. 7
- Lightfoot, Robert Henry. History and Interpretation in the Gospels. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.
- _____. Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels. London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1938.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst. Galiläa und Jerusalem. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936.

- Loisy, Alfred. The Birth of the Christian Religion. Trans. by L. P. Jacks. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1948.
- _____. The Gospel and The Church. Trans. by Christopher Home. London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1908.
- Lunn, Arnold. The Third Day. London: Burnes Oates, 1944.
- McCasland, Selby Vernon. The Resurrection of Jesus. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1932.
- Macdonald, Alexander B. Christian Worship in the Primitive Church. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1934.
- McGiffert, Arthur Cushman. The God of the Early Christians. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1924.
- _____. A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age (International Theological Library). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897.
- Machen, J. Gresham. The Origin of Paul's Religion. London: Hodder & Stoughton Ltd., 1921.
- Mackinnon, James. The Gospel in the Early Church. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1933.
- McNeile, A. H. New Testament Teaching in the Light of St Paul's. Cambridge: University Press, 1923.
- Macon, R. W. The Resurrection of Jesus Christ. London: Williams and Norgate, 1877.
- MacQuarrie, John. An Existentialist Theology: A Comparison of Heidegger and Bultmann. London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1955.
- Major, H. D. A., T. W. Manson, and C. J. Wright. The Mission and Message of Jesus. London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, Ltd., 1937.
- Manson, T. W. The Servant-Messiah. Cambridge: University Press, 1953.
- Manson, William. Jesus the Messiah. London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1943.
- Marsh, H. G. The Origin and Significance of the New Testament Baptism. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1941.
- Martin, James. Did Jesus Rise From the Dead? (World Christian Books, No. 12). London: United Society For Christian Literature, 1956.

- Matheson, George. Spiritual Development of St. Paul. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1890.
- Mersch, Emile. The Whole Christ. Trans. by John R. Kelly. London: Dennis Dobson Ltd., 1938.
- Meyer, Arnold. Die Auferstehung Christi. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1905.
- _____. Die moderne Forschung über Geschichte des Urchristentums. Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr, 1898.
- Milligan, William. The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of Our Lord. 2nd Ed. London: Macmillan and Co., 1894.
- _____. The Resurrection of Our Lord. 4th Ed. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1913.
- _____. The Resurrection of the Dead. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1894.
- Moffatt, James. An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament. 3rd Ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1918.
- Morgan, W. The Religion and Theology of Paul. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1917.
- Mowinckel, S. He That Cometh. Trans. by G. W. Anderson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1956.
- Muller, A. D. Religion und Alltag. 4th Ed. Berlin: Furche Verlag, 1932.
- Murray, G. R. Beasley. Christ Is Alive! London: Lutterworth Press, 1947.
- Newman, John Henry. Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification. 3rd Ed. London: Rivingtons, 1874.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold. Beyond Tragedy: Essays on the Christian Interpretation of History. London: Nisbet and Co. Ltd., 1938.
- Nineham, D. E. (Ed.). Studies In the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.
- Nygren, Anders. Christ and His Church. Trans. by Alan Carlsten. London: S.P.C.K., 1957.
- _____. The Gospel of God. Trans. by L. J. Trinterud. London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1951.

- Orr, James. The Resurrection of Jesus. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908.
- Otto, Rudolf. The Idea of the Holy. Trans. by John W. Harvey. Rev. Ed. Oxford: University Press, 1925.
- _____. The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man. Trans. by Floyd V. Filson and Bertram Lee. Rev. Ed. London: Lutterworth Press, 1943.
- Pedersen, Johs. Israel: Its Life and Culture. 4 Vols. London: Oxford University Press.
- Pfleiderer, Otto. Christian Origins. Trans. by Daniel A. Huebsch. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1905.
- _____. Lectures on the Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity. Trans. by J. F. Smith. London: Williams and Norgate, 1885.
- _____. Primitive Christianity. Ed. by W. D. Morrison and trans. by W. Montgomery. 4 Vols. London: Williams & Norgate, 1906.
- Pilcher, Charles Venn. The Hereafter in Jewish and Christian Thought with special reference to the Doctrine of Resurrection. London: Society For Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1940.
- Porter, Frank Chamberlin. The Mind of Christ in Paul. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930.
- Ramsey, Arthur Michael. The Gospel and the Catholic Church. 2nd Ed. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1956.
- _____. The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1949.
- _____. The Resurrection of Christ. 2nd Ed. London: Centenary Press, 1946.
- Rawlinson, A. E. J. The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1926.
- Redlich, E. Basil. The Student's Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1936.
- Reimarus, Hermann Samuel. Fragments From Reimarus. Trans. by G. E. Lessing and Ed. by Charles Voysey. London: Williams and Norgate, 1879.

- Reitzenstein, R. Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen. 3rd Ed. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1927.
- Renan, Ernest. The Apostles. [no translator]. London: Mathieson & Co., 1889.
- Rengstorf, Karl Heinrich. Apostleship (Bible Key Words from Gerhard Kittel's T.W.Z.N.T.—Manuals from Kittel, trans. and ed. by J. R. Coates). London: Adam and Charles Black, 1952.
- _____. Die Auferstehung Jesu: Form, Art und Sinn der urchristlichen Osterbotschaft. Zweite Auflage. Witten, Ruhr: Luther Verlag, 1954.
- Resch, Alfred. Der Paulinismus und Die Logia Jesu. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche, 1904.
- Reuss, Edward. History of Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age. 2 Vols. Trans. from the 3rd Ed. by Annie Harwood. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1872.
- Robinson, John A. T. The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1952.
- _____. In the End, God . . . : A Study of the Christian Doctrine of the Last Things. London: James Clarke & Co., Ltd., 1950.
- _____. Jesus and His Coming. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1957.
- Robinson, Wm. Childs. Christ--The Hope of Glory. 2nd Ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1947.
- Robson, John. The Resurrection Gospel: A Study of Christ's Great Commission. Edinburgh: Cliphant Anderson & Ferrier, 1908.
- Rostron, S. Nowell. The Christology of St. Paul. London: Robert Scott, 1912.
- Rust, E. C. The Christian Understanding of History. London: Lutterworth Press, 1947.
- Sabatier, A. The Apostle Paul. Trans. by A. M. Hellier. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1891.
- Salmond, Stewart D. F. The Christian Doctrine of Immortality. 4th Ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901.
- Sanday, William. The Life of Christ in Recent Research. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907.

- _____. Outlines of the Life of Christ. 2nd Ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906.
- Sanders, J. N. The Foundations of the Christian Faith: A Study of the Teaching of the New Testament in the Light of Historical Criticism. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1950.
- Sayers, Dorothy L. The Man Born To Be King: A Play-Cycle on the Life of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1943.
- Schlatter, Adolf. The Church in the New Testament Period. Trans. by Paul P. Levertoff. London: S.P.C.K., 1955.
- Schniewind, Julius. Julius Schniewind: Nachgelassene Reden und Aufsätze. Ed. by Ernst Kähler. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1952.
- Schweitzer, Albert. The Mystery of the Kingdom of God. Trans. by Walter Lowrie. London: A. & C. Black, 1925.
- _____. The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle. Trans. by William Montgomery. 2nd Ed. London: A. & C. Black, 1953.
- _____. Paul and His Interpreters. Trans. by W. Montgomery. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1912.
- _____. The Quest of the Historical Jesus. 3rd Ed. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1954.
- Scott, Charles A. Anderson. Christianity According to St Paul. Cambridge: University Press, 1927.
- _____. Dominus Noster. Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons Ltd., 1918.
- Scott, E. F. The Apologetic of the New Testament. London: Williams & Norgate, 1907.
- _____. The First Age of Christianity. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1926.
- _____. The Purpose of the Gospels. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949.
- _____. The Spirit in the New Testament. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1923.
- Shaw, John Mackintosh. Christian Doctrine: A One-Volume Outline of Christian Belief. London: Lutterworth Press, 1953.

- _____. Essentials and Non-essentials of the Christian Faith.
Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928.
- _____. Life After Death. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1945.
- _____. The Resurrection of Christ. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1920.
- Shepherd, E. H. Archer-. The Nature and Evidence of the Resurrection of Christ. London: Rivingtons, 1910.
- Simpson, W. J. Sparrow. The Resurrection and Modern Thought. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1911.
- Smith, P. Gardner-. The Narratives of the Resurrection. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1926.
- _____. Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels. Cambridge: University Press, 1938.
- Smith, W. Robertson. Lectures on the Religion of the Semites. New Ed. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1894.
- Sokolowski, Emil. Die Begriffe Geist und Leben bei Paulus in ihren Beziehungen zu einander. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903.
- Somerville, David. St. Paul's Conception of Christ. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897.
- Stacey, W. David. The Pauline View of Man. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1956.
- Stählin, William. The Mystery of God. Trans. by R. Birch Hoyle. London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1937.
- _____. Vom Schicksal und Sinn der deutschen Jugend. 2nd Auflage. Wulfingeroode-Sollstedt: Treue-Verlag, 1927.
- Stauffer, Ethelbert. New Testament Theology. Trans. by John Marsh. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1955.
- Steiner, Rudolf. From Jesus to Christ. London: The Rudolf Steiner Publishing Co., 1930.
- Stevens, George Barker. The Pauline Theology. London: Richard D. Dickinson, 1892.
- _____. The Theology of the New Testament. 2nd Ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1918.

- Stewart, James S. A Faith To Proclaim. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1953.
- _____. A Man In Christ. London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1935.
- Streeter, Burnett Hillman. The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins. Rev. Ed. London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1930.
- _____. et al. Immortality. London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1918.
- Swete, Henry Barclay. The Akhmim Fragment of the Apocryphal Gospel of St Peter. London: Macmillan and Co., 1893.
- _____. The Appearances of Our Lord After the Passion. London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1907.
- _____. Life of the World to Come. London: S.P.C.K., 1917.
- Talbot, Neville S. The Mind of the Disciples. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1914.
- Taylor, Vincent. The Cross of Christ. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1956.
- _____. Forgiveness and Reconciliation. 2nd Ed. London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1946.
- _____. The Formation of the Gospel Tradition. London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1933.
- _____. The Life and Ministry of Jesus. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1954.
- _____. The Names of Jesus. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1953.
- _____. The Person of Christ. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1958.
- Teichmann, Ernst. Die paulinischen Vorstellungen von Auferstehung und Gericht. Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr, 1896.
- Thackeray, Henry St. John. The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1900.
- Thorburn, T. J. Resurrection Narratives and Modern Criticism. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. Ltd., 1910.
- Thornton, L. S. The Common Life in the Body of Christ. 3rd Ed. Westminster: Dacre Press, 1950.

- Usteri, Leonhard. Entwicklung des Paulineschen Lehrbegriffes in seinem Verhältnisse zur biblischen Dogmatik des Neuen Testamentes. 6th Ed. Zürich: Orell, Füssli und Comp., 1851.
- Weiss, Bernhard. Biblical Theology of the New Testament. Trans. from the third Rev. Ed. by David Eaton. 2 Vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1882.
- _____. The Life of Christ. Trans. by John Walter Hope. 3 Vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909.
- Weiss, Johannes. Christ The Beginning of Dogma. Trans. by V. D. Davis. London: Philip Green, 1911.
- _____. The History of Primitive Christianity. Completed by Rudolf Knopf. Trans. by four friends and ed. by Frederick C. Grant. 2 Vols. London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1937.
- Weizsäcker, Carl Von. The Apostolic Age. Trans. from the 2nd and Rev. Ed. by James Millar. 2 Vols. London: Williams and Norgate, 1894.
- Welch, Charles H. Just. and the Justifier. Banstead, Surrey, England: Leonard A. Canning, 1948.
- Werner, Martin. The Formation of Christian Dogma. Trans. by S. G. F. Brandon. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1957.
- Wernle, Paul. The Beginnings of Christianity. Trans. by G. A. Binemann. 2 Vols. London: Williams and Norgate, 1903.
- Westcott, B. F. The Gospel of the Resurrection. 9th Ed. London: Macmillan and Co., 1913.
- Whale, J. S. Christian Doctrine. Cambridge: University Press, 1941.
- Willoughby, Harold R. Pagan Regeneration: A Study of Mystery Initiations in the Graeco-Roman World. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.
- Wood, Theodore. The Second Adam or How Does Christ's Humanity Affect Our Own. London: Skeffington & Son, 1912.
- Woolf, Bertram Lee. The Authority of Jesus and Its Foundation. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1929.
- Wrede, W. Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901.

_____. Paul. Trans. by Edward Lummis. London: Philip Green, 1907.

Zankov, Stefan. The Eastern Orthodox Church. Trans. by Donald A. Lowrie. London: Student Christian Movement, 1929.

Zimmerli, W., and J. Jeremias. The Servant of God (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 20). London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1957.

B. ARTICLES

Albertz, Martin. "Zur Formengeschichte der Auferstehungsberichte," Z.N.T.W., 1922, Heft 4, pp. 259-269.

Allen, E. L. "The Lost Kerygma," N.T.S., III, No. 4 (July, 1957), pp. 349-353.

Argyle, A. W. "The New Testament Doctrine of the Resurrection of Our Lord Jesus Christ," E.T., LXI, No. 6 (March, 1950), pp. 187-188.

Armstrong, William Park. "The Place of the Resurrection Appearances of Jesus," Biblical and Theological Studies. By the members of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912), pp. 307-355.

Bacon, Benjamin W. "The Resurrection in Primitive Tradition and Observance," The American Journal of Theology, XV, No. 3 (July, 1911), pp. 392-403.

Baird, William. "What Is the Kerygma? A Study of I Cor 15:3-8 and Gal 1:11-17," J.B.L., LXXVI, Part III (Sept., 1957), pp. 181-191.

Barling, T. J. "Physical Resurrection," Dare We Believe (a series of addresses designed for those who feel that there is a conflict between modern knowledge and religious belief), Birmingham: The Christadelphians, 1951?, pp. 1-16.

Black, Matthew. "The Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam," S.J.T., VII, No. 2 (June, 1954), pp. 170-179.

Brun, Lyder. "Zur Auslegung von II Cor. 5:1-10," Z.N.T.W., 1929, Heft 3/4, pp. 207-229.

Büchsel, Friedrich. "'In Christus' bei Paulus," Z.N.T.W., XLII (1949), pp. 141-158.

- Bultmann, Rudolf. "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein Jesu und das Petrus-Bekenntnis," Z.N.T.W. XIX, No. 3/4 (1919-20), pp. 165-169.
- _____. "The Study of the Synoptic Gospels," Form Criticism: A New Method of New Testament Research, by Rudolf Bultmann and Karl Kundsinn, trans. by Frederick C. Grant (Chicago: Willett, Clark & Co., 1934), pp. 11-75.
- _____. "New Testament and Mythology," Kerygma and Myth: A Theological Debate, ed. by Hans Werner Bartsch, trans. by Reginald H. Fuller (London: S.P.C.K., 1953), pp. 1-44.
- Burkill, T. A. "Concerning St. Mark's Conception of Secrecy," The Hibbert Journal, LV (Jan., 1957), pp. 150-158.
- Burkitt, F. C. "On I Corinthians xv 26," J.T.S., XVII (1916), pp. 384-385.
- Cadbury, Henry J. "Acts and Eschatology," B.N.T.I.E., W. D. Davies and D. Daube, eds. (Cambridge: University Press, 1956), pp. 300-321.
- Cameron, J. K. "The Resurrection of Christ," The Evangelical Quarterly, VI, (April 14, 1934), pp. 147-168.
- Case, Shirley Jackson. "ΚΤΡΙΟΣ as a Title for Christ," J.B.L., XXVI (1907), pp. 151-161.
- _____. "The Resurrection Faith of the First Disciples," The American Journal of Theology, XIII, No. 2 (April, 1909), pp. 169-192.
- Cerfaux, Lucien. "'Kyrios' dans les citations pauliniennes de l'Ancien Testament," in Recueil Lucien Cerfaux: Études d'Exégèse et d'Histoire Religieuse de Monseigneur Cerfaux, Tome I (Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1954), pp. 173-188.
- Clavier, H. "Brèves remarques sur la notion de τὸ πνευματικόν," B.N.T.I.E., W. D. Davies and D. Daube, eds. (Cambridge: University Press, 1956), pp. 342-362.
- Cross, L. B. "Jesus: His Resurrection and Ascension," The Modern Churchman, XXXVI, No. 4,5,&6 (Sept., 1946), pp. 195-211.
- Cullmann, Oscar. "The Kingship of Christ and the Church in the New Testament," The Early Church, ed. by A. J. B. Higgins (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1956), pp. 101-137.

- _____. "The Meaning of the Lord's Supper in Primitive Christianity," Essays on the Lord's Supper (Ecumenical Studies in Worship, No. 1), by Oscar Cullmann and F. J. Leenhardt, trans. by J. G. Davies (London: Lutterworth Press, 1958), pp. 5-23.
- _____. "The Proleptic Deliverance of the Body according to the New Testament," The Early Church, pp. 165-173.
- _____. "La signification de la Sainte-Cène dans le christianisme primitif," R.H.P.R., 1936, pp. 1-22.
- _____. "Unsterblichkeit der Seele und Auferstehung der Toten. Das Zeugnis des Neuen Testaments," Theologische Zeitschrift, Jahrgang 12, Heft 2 (März-April, 1956), pp. 126-156.
- Dahl, N. A. "Christ, Creation and the Church," B.N.T.I.E., W. D. Davies and D. Daube, eds. (Cambridge: University Press, 1956), pp. 422-443.
- Dodd, C. H. "The Appearances of the Risen Christ: An Essay in Form-Criticism of the Gospels," Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), pp. 9-35.
- _____. "The History and Doctrine of the Apostolic Age," A Companion to the Bible, ed. by T. W. Manson (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1939), pp. 390-417.
- _____. "The Kingdom of God and the Present Situation," The Christian Newsletter, Supplement No. 31 (May 29, 1940).
- _____. "The Mind of Paul: Change and Development," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XVII, No. 1 (Jan., 1934), pp. 3-44.
- Duncan, G. S. "The Resurrection Faith," E.T., XXXVII, No. 7 (April, 1926), pp. 330-333.
- Egan, M. F. "Faith and the Resurrection," The Month, CLXIX, No. 874 (April, 1937), pp. 301-305.
- Ernesti, L. "Philipp. II, 6 ff. (aus einer Anspielung auf Genes. II, III)," Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1848, Heft 4, pp. 858-924.
- Evans, C. F. "'I will go before you into Galilee,'" J.T.S., V, Part I (April, 1954), pp. 3-18.
- Fascher, Erich. "Die Auferstehung Jesu und ihr Verhältnis zur urchristlichen Verkündigung," Z.N.T.W., XXVI(1927), Heft 1, pp. 1-26.

- Filson, Floyd V. "The Focus of History: The Resurrection in Biblical Theology," Interpretation, II, No. 1 (Jan., 1948), pp. 24-38.
- Florovsky, G. "The Lamb of God," S.J.T., IV (1951), pp. 13-28.
- Foerster, Werner. "Κύριος," T.W.N.T., III, (1938), pp. 1038-1056, 1081-1098.
- Fridrichsen, Anton. "The Apostle and his Message," Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift: Recueil De Travaux Publiés Par L'université D'Uppsala (Uppsala: A. B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln), 1947, No. 3, pp. 1-23.
- _____. "Jesus, St John and St Paul," The Root of the Vine, by Anton Fridrichsen et al. (London: Dacre Press, 1953), pp. 37-62.
- Garvie, A. E. "The Resurrection and Pentecost," London Quarterly & Holborn Review, CLXVI (July, 1941), pp. 299-311.
- Geier, Woodrow A. "God Revealed," Religion In Life, XXII, No. 2 (Spring, 1953), pp. 212-217.
- Glanville, Reginald. "The Psalms and the Resurrection of Jesus," London Quarterly and Holborn Review, CLXXVI--Sixth Series, Vol. XX (July, 1951), pp. 209-215.
- Goguel, M. "Le caractère du salut dans la théologie paulinienne," B.N.T.I.E., W. D. Davies and D. Daube, eds. (Cambridge: University Press, 1956), pp. 322-341.
- Grant, Robert M. "The Resurrection of the Body," Part I, The Journal of Religion, XXVII, No. 2 (April, 1948), pp. 120-130; Part II, Vol. XXVIII, No. 3 (July, 1948), pp. 188-208.
- Griffiths, D. R. "'The Lord is the Spirit' (2 Corinthians iii. 17,18)," E.T., LV, No. 3 (Dec., 1943), pp. 81-83.
- Grundmann, Walter. "ἐκθνήμεν." "ἐνθνήμεν." T.W.N.T., II (1935), pp. 62-64.
- Hadfield, P. "The Resurrection Body," The Church Quarterly Review, CLVIII, No. 328 (July-Sept., 1957), pp. 296-305.
- Haroutunian, Joseph. "The Doctrine of the Ascension," Interpretation, X, No. 3 (July, 1956), pp. 270-281.
- _____. "Sin and Salvation," Religion In Life, XXI, No. 2 (Spring, 1952), pp. 163-174, 195-206.

- Harris, C. "State of the Dead," Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, XI, ed. by James Hastings (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908), pp. 833-838.
- Hartford, R. R. "St. Paul, Plato and Immortality," Hermathena, LXV (May, 1945), pp. 74-79.
- Hatch, William H. P. "The Holy Spirit in St. Paul," Paulus--Hellas--Oikumene: An Ecumenical Symposium (Athens: The Students Christian Association of Greece, 1951), pp. 159-163.
- _____. "St. Paul's View of the Future Life," Paulus--Hellas--Oikumene, pp. 89-96.
- Hettlinger, R. F. "2 Corinthians 5.1-10," S.J.T., X, No. 2 (June, 1957), pp. 174-194.
- Higgins, A. J. B. "The Growth of New Testament Theology," S.J.T., VI (1953), pp. 275-286.
- Huffman, Norman. "Emmaus Among the Resurrection Narratives," J.B.L., LXIV, Part II (June, 1945), pp. 205-226.
- Jeremias, Joachim. "Ἀδὰμ," T.W.N.T., I (1933), pp. 141-143.
- _____. "'Flesh and Blood Cannot Inherit the Kingdom of God,'" N.T.S., II (1955-56), pp. 151-159.
- Kirk, Kenneth E. "The Atonement," Essays Catholic & Critical, ed. by Edward Gordon Selwyn, 3rd ed. (London: S.P.C.K., 1929), pp. 247-278.
- Knox, Wilfred L. "The 'Divine Hero' Christology in the New Testament," H.T.R., XLI, No. 4 (Oct., 1948), p. 231.
- Koegel, Julius. "ὁ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμα ἔστιν," Aus Schrift und Geschichte: theological essays presented to Adolf Schlatter on his 70th birthday (Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, Stuttgart, 1922), pp. 43-44.
- Kuhn, K. G. "ἡ ἀπολογία," T.W.N.T., IV (1942), pp. 470-475.
- Leaney, Robert. "The Resurrection Narratives in Luke (xxiv. 12-53)," N.T.S., II (1955-1956), pp. 110-114.
- Leitch, J. W. "The Injunctions of Silence in Mark's Gospel," E.T., LXVI, No. 6 (March, 1955), pp. 178-182.
- Lilley, A. L. "The Faith of the Resurrection as 'Life in Christ,'" Theology, XXIX, No. 172 (Oct., 1934), pp. 199-208.

- Oepke, Albrecht. "ἐκδύω," "ἐνδύω," T.W.N.T., II (1935), pp. 318-321.
- _____. "ἐν," T.W.N.T., II (1935), pp. 537-539.
- _____. "γυμνός," T.W.N.T., I (1933), pp. 773-774.
- Porter, Frank Chamberlin. "Paul's Belief in Life After Death," Religion and the Future Life, ed. by E. Hershey Sneath (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1922?), pp. 225-258.
- _____. "The Place of Apocalyptical Conceptions in the Thought of Paul," J.B.L., XLI (1922), Parts I and II, pp. 183-204.
- Ramsey, A. M. "The Resurrection: History and Theology," The Modern Churchman, XXXV, No. 7, 8 & 9 (Oct.-Dec., 1945), pp. 295-303.
- _____. "What Was the Ascension?" in Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, Bulletin II (Oxford: The Oxonian Press Ltd., 1951), pp. 43-50.
- Rawlinson, A. E. J. "The Filioque Clause," S.J.T., X, No. 2 (June, 1957), pp. 166-173.
- _____. "The Interpretation of the Christ in the New Testament," Foundations: A Statement of Christian Belief in Terms of Modern Thought, by B. H. Streeter et al. (London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1912), pp. 147-210.
- Riddle, Donald W. "The Cephas-Peter Problem, and a Possible Solution," J.B.L., LIX, Part II (June, 1940), pp. 169-180.
- Robinson, J. A. "Paul's Knowledge of Jesus," The Congregational Quarterly, XIII, No. 3 (1935), p. 302.
- Robinson, John A. T. "The Most Primitive Christology of All?," Journal of Theological Studies, N.S. Vol. VII, Part II (Oct., 1956), pp. 177-189.
- _____. "Traces of a Liturgical Sequence in I Cor. 16:20-24," Journal of Theological Studies, N.S., Vol. IV, Part I (April, 1953), pp. 38-41.
- Robinson, W. "'The First Resurrection' and 'the Second Death' in the Apocalypse," Theology, XLVI, No. 275 (May, 1943), pp. 97-102.
- Robinson, William Childs. "The Bodily Resurrection of Christ," Theologische Zeitschrift, Jahrgang XIII, Heft 2 (März-April, 1957), pp. 81-101.

- Rordam, T. S. "What Was the Lost End of St. Mark's Gospel?," Hibbert Journal, III (July, 1905), p. 787.
- Ryder, William H. "The Recent Literature upon the Resurrection of Christ," H.T.R., II, No. 1 (Jan., 1909), pp. 1-27.
- Sasse, Hermann. "Jesus Christ, the Lord," Mysterium Christi, ed. by G. K. A. Bell and Adolf Deissmann (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1930), pp. 93-120.
- Schmiedel, P. W. "Resurrection-and Ascension-Narratives," Encyclopaedia Biblica, ed. by T. K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black, Unabridged Ed. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1914), cols. 4039-4087.
- Schrenk, Gottlob. "δΙΚΔΙΩΤΙΣ," T.W.N.T., II (1935), p. 228.
- Schweizer, E. "Discipleship and Belief in Jesus as Lord from Jesus to the Hellenistic Church," trans. by H. F. Peacock, N.T.S., II (1955-1956), pp. 87-99.
- Selwyn, Edward Gordon. "The Authority of Christ in the New Testament," N.T.S., II, No. 2 (Jan., 1957), pp. 83-92.
- _____. "The Resurrection," Essays Catholic & Critical, ed. by E. G. Selwyn, 3rd Ed. (London: S.P.C.K., 1929), pp. 279-319.
- Sevenster, J. N. "Einige Bemerkungen über den 'Zwischenzustand' bei Paulus," N.T.S., I (1954-1955), pp. 291-296.
- _____. "Some Remarks on the Γ Τ Μ Ν Ο Σ in II Cor. V.3," Studia Paulina: in Honorem Johannis De Zwaan (Haarlem: De Erven F. Bohn N.V., 1953), pp. 202-214.
- Smith, P. Gardner. "The Resurrection," The Modern Churchman, XXXV, Nos. 1, 2 & 3 (April-June, 1945), pp. 73-83.
- Stählin, Gustav W. "On the Third Day," trans. by Wayne P. Todd, Interpretation, X, No. 3 (July, 1950), pp. 282-299.
- Stählin, Harald. "The New Exodus of Salvation According to St Paul," The Root of the Vine, by Anton Fridrichsen et al. (London: Dacre Press, 1953), pp. 81-95.
- Steuart, R. H. J. "The Resurrection," The Month, CLXXXI, No. 944 (March-April, 1945), pp. 106-110.
- Taylor, Vincent. "Great Texts Reconsidered," E.T., L, No. 6 (March, 1939), p. 298.

- _____. "Messianic Secret in Mark: Rejoinder to Dr. T. A. Burkill," The Hibbert Journal, LVI (April, 1957), pp. 241-248.
- Turner, C. H. "Chronology in the New Testament," Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1899), Vol. I, pp. 403-425.
- Vos, Geerhardus. "Alleged Development in Paul's Teaching on the Resurrection," Princeton Theological Review, XXVII (Jan.-July, 1929), pp. 193-226.
- _____. "The Eschatological Aspect of the Pauline Conception of the Spirit," Biblical and Theological Studies, by the members of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912), pp. 209-259.
- _____. "The Kyrios Christos Controversy," Princeton Theological Review, XV (1917), pp. 21-89.
- _____. "The Pauline Doctrine of the Resurrection," Princeton Theological Review, XXVII (Jan., 1929), pp. 1-35.
- _____. "The Pauline Eschatology and Chiliasm," Princeton Theological Review, IX, No. 1 (Jan., 1911), pp. 26-60.
- Westbrook, Francis B. "The Resurrection Narratives," E.T., LI, No. 6 (March, 1940), pp. 277-282.
- Whale, J. S. "The Resurrection of the Body and the Life Everlasting," Religion in Life, XVIII, No. 3 (Summer, 1949), pp. 434-444.
- Wilder, Amos N. "Variant Traditions of the Resurrection in Acts," J.B.L., LXII, Part IV (Dec., 1943), pp. 307-318.
- Wilson, William E. "The Development of Paul's Doctrine of Dying and Rising again with Christ," E.T., XLII, No. 12 (Sept. 1931), pp. 562-565.
- Winter, Paul. "I Corinthians XV 3b-7," Novum Testamentum, II, Fasc. 2 (April, 1957), pp. 142-150.
- Woolf, Bertram Lee. "The Authority of the Risen Lord," The Congregational Quarterly, V, No. 4 (Oct., 1927), pp. 397-408.

C. COMMENTARIES

- Barth, Karl. The Epistle to the Romans. Trans. from the 6th Ed. by Edwyn C. Hoskyns. Oxford: University Press, 1933.
- Beet, Joseph Agar. A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1882.
- Boylan, Patrick Canon. St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son, Ltd., 1934.
- Bruce, F. F. Commentary on the Book of the Acts. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Ltd., 1954.
- Burton, Ernest De Witt. The Epistle to the Galatians (The International Critical Commentary). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921.
- Calvin, Jean. Commentaires sur le Prophète Isaii. Ed. and Trans. by Nicolas des Gallars. Geneva: François Perrin, 1572.
- Craig, Clarence Tucker. "The First Epistle to the Corinthians" (Exegetical Commentary), I.B., X (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1954).
- Dibelius, Martin. Studies in the Acts of the Apostles. Ed. by Heinrich Greeven. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1956.
- Dodd, C. H. The Epistle to the Romans (M.N.T.C.). London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932.
- Dodd, J. Theodore. The Gospel According to the Hebrews. London: The Search Publishing Co., 1933.
- Dods, Marcus. The First Epistle to the Corinthians. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1889.
- Duncan, George S. The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians (M.N.T.C.). London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1934.
- Edwards, T. C. A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. 2nd Ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1885.
- Ellicott, C. J. St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians. London: London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1887.
- Goudge, H. L. The First Epistle to the Corinthians (Westminster Commentaries). London: Methuen & Co., 1903.

- _____. The Second Epistle to the Corinthians (Westminster Commentaries). London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1927.
- Griffith, Gwilym O. St. Paul's Gospel to the Romans. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1949.
- Grosheide, F. W. Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. 2nd Ed. Edinburgh: Marshall & Scott, Ltd., 1954.
- Hanson, R. P. C. II Corinthians (Torch Bible Commentaries). London: SCM Press Ltd., 1954.
- Héring, Jean. La première épître de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens (Commentaire Du Nouveau Testament VII). Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé S.A., 1949.
- The Homilies of S. John Chrysostom on the First Epistle of St. Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians. [no translator]. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1839.
- Jackson, F. J. Foakes, and Kirsopp Lake (Eds.). The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I: The Acts of the Apostles. 5 Vols. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1920-1933.
- Kelly, William. An Exposition of the Acts of the Apostles. 3rd Ed. London: C. A. Hammond, 1952.
- Knowling, R. J. The Witness of the Epistles. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1892.
- Knox, John. "The Epistle to the Romans" (Exegetical Commentary), I.B., IX (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1954).
- Lake, Kirsopp. The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul. London: Rivingtons, 1911.
- Lietzmann, Hans. Die Briefe Des Apostels Paul: Einführung in Die Textgeschichte Der Paulusbriefe An Die Römer (H.B.N.T., Dritter Band). Zweite Auflage. Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr, 1919.
- _____. An die Korinther (H.B.N.T.). Zweite Auflage. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1923.
- Lightfoot, J. B. St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. 10th Ed. London: Macmillan and Co., 1890.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst. Die Briefe an die Philipper, an die Kolosser und an Philemon (Meyer's Kommentar zum N. Testament). 8th Ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1930.

- McCullough, W. Stewart. "The Book of Psalms" (Exegetical Commentary), I.B., Vol. IV (New York: Abingdon Press, 1955).
- Macgregor, G. H. C. The Gospel of John (M.N.T.C.). London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1928.
- MacRory, Joseph. The Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians. Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son, Ltd., 1935.
- Manson, William. The Gospel of Luke (M.N.T.C.). London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930.
- Martindale, C. C. The Gospel According to Saint Mark. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1955.
- Meyer, Werner. Der erste Brief an die Korinther. 2 Vols. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1945.
- Moffatt, James. The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians (M.N.T.C.). London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938.
- Nygren Anders. Commentary on Romans. Trans. by Carl C. Rasmussen. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1952.
- Plummer, Alfred. Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (The International Critical Commentary). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1915.
- Rackham, Richard Belward. The Acts of the Apostles. 10th Ed. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1925.
- Rawlinson, A. E. J. St. Mark. 2nd Ed. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1927.
- Robertson, Archibald, and Alfred Plummer. First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (The International Critical Commentary). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911.
- Sanday, William, and Arthur C. Headlam. The Epistle to the Romans (The International Critical Commentary). 5th Ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908.
- Stagg, Frank. The Book of Acts. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1955.
- Strack, Hermann L., und Paul Billerbeck. Die Briefe Des Neuen Testaments und Die Offenbarung Johannis (Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, Vol. 3). Zweite Auflage. Munchen: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1926.

Synge, F. C. St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. London: S.P.C.K., 1941.

Taylor, Vincent. The Epistle to the Romans. London: The Epworth Press, 1955.

_____. The Gospel According to St. Mark. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1952.

Temple, William. Readings in St. John's Gospel. Second Series (Chapters XIII-XXI). London: Macmillan and Co., 1940.

Weiss, Johannes. Der erste Korintherbrief (Meyer, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament). 10th Ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1925.

D. OTHER REFERENCES

The Apocryphal New Testament. Trans. by M. R. James. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924.

The Apostolic Fathers: The DIDACHE, or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles (Loeb Classical Library). Trans. by Kirsopp Lake. 2 Vols. London: William Heinemann, 1912.

The Apostolic Fathers: The Epistles of S. Clement, S. Ignatius, S. Barnabas, S. Polycarp. Trans. by Charles H. Hoole. 2nd Ed. London: Rivingtons, 1885)

The Apostolical Fathers. Trans. by James Donaldson. London: Macmillan and Co., 1874.

Arndt, William F., and F. Wilbur Gingrich. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Cambridge: University Press, 1957.

Barnes, Robert Blake. The Eschatological Reference of the Cardinal Concepts of St. Paul's Theology (unpublished thesis). The University of Edinburgh, 1957.

Book of Common Prayer. Oxford: University Press, [n.d.].

Charles, R. H. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. 2 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

Eusebius. Ecclesiastical History (Loeb Classical Library). Trans. by J. E. L. Oulton. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1932.

- Gebhardt, Oscar von, und Adolf Harnack (Eds.). Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Der Altchristlichen Literatur. Dreizehnter Band. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1895.
- Goodspeed, Edgar J. The Student's New Testament. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1948.
- Hastings, James (Ed.). A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. 2 Vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906.
- The Holy Bible. Revised Standard Version. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1952.
- Liddell, H. G., and Robert Scott. A Greek-English Lexicon. 2 Vols. New Ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.
- Midrash Rabbah. Trans. under the editorship of Rabbi H. Freedman and Maurice Simon. 10 Vols. London: Soncino Press, 1939.
- Moffatt, James. The New Testament. New Revised Ed. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1935.
- Nestle, Eberhard. Novum Testamentum Graece. 22 Auflage. Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1956.
- Pliny. Letters (Loeb Classical Library). 2 Vols. Revised by W. M. L. Hutchinson. London: William Heinemann, 1915.
- Robbins, Ray Frank. A Critical Examination of the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians with Special Reference to the Background of the Corinthian Church (unpublished thesis). Edinburgh: The University of Edinburgh, 1950.
- Schaff, Philip. The Oldest Church Manual (The Didache and kindred documents). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1885.
- Souter, A. Tertullian Concerning the Resurrection of the Flesh (Translations of Christian Literature, Series II, Latin Texts). London: S.P.C.K., 1922.
- Suetonius (Loeb Classical Library). Trans. by J. C. Rolfe. 2 Vols. London: William Heinemann, 1914.
- The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas. Trans. by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. 22 Vols. London: R. & T. Washbourne, 1911-1935.
- Swete, Henry Barclay (Ed.). The Old Testament in Greek. 3 Vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1894.

- Tertullian. Apology (Loeb Classical Library). Trans. by Gerald H. Rendall. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1931.
- Vine, W. E. An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words. 4 Vols. London: Oliphants Ltd., 1939-1941.
- Williams, Charles B. The New Testament. Chicago: Moody Press, 1953.
- Wood, Carol Andrew. St. Paul's Conception of the Humanity of Jesus Christ (unpublished thesis). The University of Edinburgh, 1954.
- The Works of S. Justin the Martyr (Library of Fathers). [no translator] Oxford: J. H. and Jas. Parker, 1861.
- The Writings of Origen (Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. XXIII), 2 Vols. Trans. by Frederick Crombie. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1872.

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Name of Candidate FRANCIS SMALL CHESSON

Degree DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY Date SEPTEMBER 1958

Title of Thesis THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESURRECTION FOR THE APOSTOLIC MESSAGE

..... WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE APOSTLE PAUL

The resurrection is the starting-point and interpretative factor of New Testament theology. The appearances of the Risen Christ rallied the apostles, restored their confidence and gave them a message to proclaim. As the climactic event in Jesus' life, the resurrection first of all caused the disciples to re-interpret the Person of Christ. The scandal of the cross was now removed and they saw Jesus as the Christ, the Messiah, who was exalted by God. In his Damascus experience the Apostle Paul discovered the Risen Jesus as the Messiah and Lord, and while he shared the primitive church's claims for Jesus, he at the same time saw the Christ in a broader perspective--as a world Redeemer. No longer was the title "Lord" a mere title of respect as it had been during Jesus' earthly ministry; it was now a post-resurrection designation referring to the intense devotion of the disciples for One who is reigning and all powerful. Particularly significant is the constant use of the title in connection with the worship of the apostolic church: in prayer, baptism, the Lord's Supper, and the day on which they met for worship. Christ's Sonship was re-appraised by Paul in that while Christ was thought of as the pre-existent and eternal Son, His resurrection openly proclaimed Him as Son of God "in power." Christ, by virtue of His resurrection and exaltation, became the Last Adam, the author and perfecter of the new aeon and of the new redeemed humanity wherein life is supreme over death.

Likewise, the work of Christ was seen in light of the resurrection in that this act of God played an interpretative rôle in the apostles' understanding of the significance of the cross. In addition, the resurrection opened the way for new and greater activity on the part of the Risen One. He sends the Holy Spirit who operates in the lives of the disciples to bring about a fellowship between the Risen Lord and His followers and to anticipate the final resurrection. The resurrection is related to justification in that justification becomes an accomplished fact only through Christ's rising again. Christ's resurrection is



the source of a new life in the present age in that the believer dies with Christ, rises with Him, and becomes one with the Risen Lord.

The future resurrection brings to completion the order of resurrection which began when God raised His Son from the dead. There is a close relationship between Christ's rising and the final resurrection in that the same Spirit who was the active agent in Christ's resurrection is to accomplish the final resurrection of the dead. So also the nature of the future resurrection body is patterned after Christ's; it is a transformed and glorified body, distinct from its mortal counterparts and yet inherently one with it as its continuation. The Apostle teaches that the believer receives his resurrection body not at the moment of death but at the parousia. In the event that the believer dies before the parousia he has the assurance of continuing in Christ even during the imperfect intermediate period.

While Paul develops new thoughts about the resurrection body, he does not radically alter his earlier views; nor is there sufficient evidence to show that he was greatly influenced by Hellenism, or that he believed in two separate resurrections with an intervening Messianic Kingdom. The doctrine of the resurrection was of fundamental importance for the earliest of the disciples, but it was left largely to the Apostle to develop the Christological, Soteriological, and Eschatological significance of this mighty act of God.